arXiv:1401.1649v1 [math.FA] 8 Jan 2014

A counterexample to the weak density of smooth maps between manifolds in Sobolev spaces

Fabrice BETHUEL * †

Abstract

The present paper presents a counterexample to the sequentially weak density of smooth maps between two manifolds $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ in the Sobolev space $W^{1,p}(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N})$, in the case p is an integer. It has been shown (see e.g. [6]) that, if $p < \dim \mathcal{M}$ is not an integer and the $[p]$-th homotopy group $\pi_{[p]}(\mathcal{N})$ of $\mathcal{N}$ is not trivial, $[p]$ denoting the largest integer less then p, then smooth maps are not sequentially weakly dense in $W^{1,p}(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N})$ for *the strong convergence*. On the other, in the case $p < \dim \mathcal{M}$ is an integer, examples have been provided where smooth maps are actually sequentially weakly dense in $W^{1,p}(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N})$ with $\pi_p(\mathcal{N}) \neq 0$. This is the case for instance for $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{B}^m$, the standard ball in $\mathbb{R}^m$, and $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{S}^p$ the standard sphere of dimension p, for which $\pi_p(\mathcal{N}) = \mathbb{Z}$. The main result of this paper shows however that such a property does not holds for arbitrary manifolds $\mathcal{N}$ and integers p.

Our counterexample deals with the case $p = 3$, $\dim \mathcal{M} \geq 4$ and $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{S}^2$, for which the homotopy group $\pi_3(\mathbb{S}^2) = \mathbb{Z}$ is related to the Hopf fibration. We construct explicitly a map which is not weakly approximable in $W^{1,3}(\mathcal{M},\mathbb{S}^2)$ by maps in $C^\infty(\mathcal{M},\mathbb{S}^2)$. One of the central ingredients in our argument is related to issues in branched transportation and irrigation theory in the case of the exponent is critical, which are possibly of independent interest. As a byproduct of our method, we also address some questions concerning the $\mathbb{S}^3$-lifting problem for $\mathbb{S}^2$-valued Sobolev maps.

1 Introduction

1.1 Setting and statements

The $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ be two manifolds, with $\mathcal{N}$ isometrically embedded in some euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^\ell$, $\mathcal{M}$ having possibly a boundary. For given numbers $0 < s < \infty$ and $1 \leq p < \infty$, we consider the Sobolev space $W^{s,p}(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N})$ of maps between $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ defined by

$$W^{s,p}(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N}) = \{u \in W^{s,p}(\mathcal{M},\mathbb{R}^\ell),\ u(x) \in \mathcal{N} \text{ for almost every } x \in \mathcal{M}\}.$$

The study of these spaces is motivated in particular by various problems in physics, as liquid crystal theory, Yang-Mills-Higgs or Ginzburg-Landau models, where singularities of topological nature appear, yielding maps which are hence not continuous but belong to suitable

*Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, UMR 7598, Laboratoire Jacques-Louis Lions, F-75005, Paris, France

†CNRS, UMR 7598, Laboratoire Jacques-Louis Lions, F-75005, Paris, France

Sobolev spaces, built up in view of the corresponding variational frameworks. Starting with the seminal works of Schoen and Uhlenbeck ([27]), this field of research has grown quite fast in the last decades. A central issue is the approximation of maps in $W^{s,p}(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N})$ by smooth maps (or maps with singularities of prescribed type) between $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$. Restricting ourselves to the case $s = 1$, is as we will do actually in the rest of the paper, it is easily seen that, if $p > m \equiv \dim \mathcal{M}$ then smooth maps are indeed dense in $W^{1,p}(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N})$, with no restriction on the target manifold $\mathcal{N}$, since they are already Hölder continuous due to Sobolev embedding, and standard arguments based on mollifying and reprojections allow to conclude. The result and the argument extend to the limiting case $p = \dim \mathcal{M}$. It turns out that, when $1 \leq p < \dim \mathcal{M}$, the answer to the approximation problem is strongly related to the nature of the $[p]$-th homotopy group $\pi_{[p]}(\mathcal{N})$ of the target manifold $\mathcal{N}$, where $[p]$ denotes the largest integer less or equal to p. Indeed, if $\pi_{[p]}(\mathcal{N}) \neq 0$, then as we will recall below, one may construct maps in $W^{1,p}(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N})$ which cannot be approximated by smooth maps between $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ for the *strong topology* (see [6]), whereas the condition $\pi_{[p]}(\mathcal{N}) = 0$ yields approximability be smooth maps when the domain has a simple topology, for instance a ball (see Sections I to IV in [6]). When the domain $\mathcal{M}$ has a more complicated topology, it was shown in [17, 18] that it might induce some other obstructions to the approximation problem, obstructions which has actually been mist in [6]. [1]

Approximation by sequences of smooth maps at the level of the *weak convergence* is the focus of the present paper. In order to avoid problems with the topology of $\mathcal{M}$ we restrict ourselves *first* to the case $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{B}^m$, the standard ball of $\mathbb{R}^m$ and, motivated by the previous discussion, we assume that

$$1 \leq p < m \text{ and } \pi_{[p]}(\mathcal{N}) \neq 0. \tag{1}$$

Indeed if one of the conditions in (1) is not met, then we already now that $C^\infty(\mathbb{B}^m,\mathcal{N})$ is dense for the strong topology in $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^m,\mathcal{N})$, hence sequentially weakly dense. As a matter of fact, we may even restrict ourselves to the case p is an integer, since the following observation made in [6] settles the case p is not:

Theorem 1. *Assume that* (1) *holds and that p is* not *an integer. Then $C^\infty(\mathbb{B}^m,\mathcal{N})$ is not sequentially weakly dense in $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^m,\mathcal{N})$.*

Since this fact is central in the discussion, we briefly sketch the argument, for the special case $m-1 < p < m$, which represents somehow the building block for the general case: in this special case we have hence $[p] = m - 1$. Since we assume in view of (1) that $\pi_{m-1}(\mathcal{N}) \neq 0$, there exists some smooth map $\varphi : \mathbb{S}^{m-1} \to \mathcal{N}$ such that φ is not homotopic to a constant map and hence cannot be extend to the ball $\mathbb{B}^m$. Consider next the map the map $\mathcal{U}_{\rm sing}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{U}_{\rm sing}(x) = \varphi\left(\frac{x}{|x|}\right), \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{B}^m \setminus \{0\}, \tag{2}$$

which is smooth, except at the origin. Introducing the p-Dirichlet energy E_p defined by

$$\mathrm{E}_p(v,\mathcal{M}) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} |\nabla v|^p dx, \text{ for } v : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}^\ell,$$

we observe that $\mathrm{E}_p(\mathcal{U}_{\rm sing},\mathbb{B}^m) = \displaystyle\int_0^1 r^{m-1-p}\left(\mathrm{E}_p(\varphi,\mathbb{S}^{m-1})\right) dr < +\infty$ so that $\mathcal{U}_{\rm sing}$ belongs to $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^m,\mathcal{N})$. Assume by contradiction that there exist a sequence $(u_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of maps in

[1] the argument in Section V [6], which is aimed to extend the case ob a cube to an arbitrary manifolds.

$C^\infty(\mathbb{B}^m,\mathcal{N})$ converging weakly to $\mathcal{U}_{\rm sing}$ in $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^m,\mathbb{R}^\ell)$. Then there exists [2] some radius $0<r<1$ such that the restriction of $(u_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ to the sphere $\mathbb{S}^{m-1}_r$ of radius r and centered at 0 convergences up to a subsequence to the restriction of $\mathcal{U}_{\rm sing}$ to $\mathbb{S}^{m-1}_r$ in $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{S}^{m-1}_r)$. By compact Sobolev embedding the convergence is *uniform* and hence $\mathcal{U}_{\rm sing}$ and u_n restricted to S^{m-1}_r are in the same homotopy class for n large. This however is a contradiction since u_n can be extended inside the sphere $\mathbb{S}^{m-1}_r$ whereas the restriction of $\mathcal{U}_{\rm sing}$ to $\mathbb{S}^{m-1}_r$ does not possess this property, yielding a contradiction and hence establishing the theorem in the case considered.

When $p=m-1$ is an integer, the previous arguments *are not valid*, since weak convergence in $W^{1,m-1}(\mathbb{S}^{m-1}_r)$ does not necessarily yield uniform convergence. As a matter of fact, we have in this case:

Proposition 1. *There exists a sequence of maps $(U_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in $C^\infty(\mathbb{B}^m,\mathcal{N})$ converging to $\mathcal{U}_{\rm sing}$ weakly in $W^{1,m-1}(\mathbb{B}^m,\mathbb{R}^\ell)$. Moreover, as $n\to+\infty$, the map U_n converges uniformly on every compact set of $\mathbb{B}^m\setminus\mathcal{I}_m$ to $\mathcal{U}_{\rm sing}$, where $\mathcal{I}_m$ denotes the segment $\mathcal{I}_m=[0,P]$ and where P denotes the north pole $P=(0,\dots,0,1)$. Moreover, we have*

$$|\nabla U_n|^{m-1}\rightharpoonup|\nabla\mathcal{U}_{\rm sing}|^{m-1}+\nu\mathcal{H}^1\llcorner[0,P]\text{ in the sense of measures on }\mathbb{B}^m,\text{ where}\tag{3}$$

$$\nu=\mathfrak{v}_{\mathcal{N},m-1}([\![\varphi]\!])=\inf\{E_{m-1}(w),w\in C^1(\mathbb{S}^{m-1},\mathcal{N})\text{ homotopic to }\varphi\}>0.$$

The previous statement is related to the so-called *bubbling* phenomenon in the critical dimension $m-1$ on the sphere $\mathbb{S}^{m-1}$.

Lemma 1. *Let $\varphi:\mathbb{S}^{m-1}\to\mathcal{N}$ be a given smooth map. Then there exists a sequence of smooth maps $(\varphi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ from $\mathbb{S}^{m-1}$ to $\mathcal{N}$ such that φ_n is homotopic to a constant map for any $n\in\mathbb{N}$, such that $\varphi_n(x)=\varphi(x)$ for any $x\in\mathbb{S}^{m-1}\setminus B^m(P,(n+1)^{-1})$ and such that we have*

$$|\nabla\varphi_n|^{m-1}\rightharpoonup|\nabla\varphi|^{m-1}+\nu\delta_P\text{ in the sense of measures on }\mathbb{S}^{m-1}\text{ as }n\to+\infty.\tag{4}$$

The bubbling phenomenon is related to scaling properties of the functional E_{m-1}, which are central in the whole discussion, and which can be stated, for a general map $u:\mathbb{B}^m\to\mathcal{N}$ and $r>0$, as

$$\mathrm{E}_p(u_r,\mathbb{B}^{m-1}_r)=r^{m-1-p}\mathrm{E}_p(u,\mathbb{B}^{m-1})\text{ where }u_r(x)=u(\frac{x}{r})\ \text{ for }x\in\mathbb{B}^{m-1}_r\equiv\mathbb{B}^{m-1}(0,r),\tag{5}$$

so that in particular in the critical dimension $p=m-1$ the energy is scale invariant, allowing for concentration at points. Proposition 1 is deduced from Lemma 1 constructing the sequence $(U_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ as

$$U_n(x)=\varphi_n\left(\frac{x}{|x|}\right)\ \text{ for }\frac{1}{n}\le|x|\le1.$$

and extend U_n inside the small ball $\mathbb{B}(\frac{1}{m})$ is a smooth way, which is possible since the map φ_n is in the trivial homotopy class, and with an energetical cost tending to 0 and n goes to $+\infty$. Since the energy of the map φ_n concentrates at the North Pole P, it follows that hence the $(m-1)$-energy of the sequence $(U_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ concentrates on the segment $[0,P]$.

[2] similar arguments, based an Fubini's theorem combined with an averaging argument, will be detailed in Section 5.

Going back to the general problem of sequentially weak density of smooth maps, the main problem to consider is hence the case

$$p \text{ is an integer, } 1 \leq p < m \text{ and } \pi_{[p]}(\mathcal{N}) \neq 0. \tag{6}$$

So far several results have been obtained, where *sequentially weak density* of smooth maps between $\mathbb{B}^m$ and $\mathcal{N}$ have been established[3]. For instance, when $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{S}^p$ for which $\pi_p(\mathcal{N}) = \mathbb{Z}$ we have:

Theorem 2 ([11, 5, 6])**.** *Let p be an integer. Then given any manifold $\mathcal{M}$, $C^\infty(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{S}^p)$ is sequentially weakly dense in $W^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{S}^p)$.*

In a related direction, a positive answer was given in [16, 24] for $(p-1)$-connected manifolds $\mathcal{N}$ and in [24] in the case $p = 2$, whatever manifold $\mathcal{N}$. The main result of this paper presents an *obstruction to sequential weak density of smooth maps* when (6) holds and deals with the special case $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{S}^2$ and $p = 3$, for which $\pi_3(\mathbb{S}^2) = \mathbb{Z}$. More precisely, the main result of this paper is the following:

Theorem 3. *Given any manifold $\mathcal{M}$ of dimension larger then 4, $C^\infty(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{S}^2)$ is* not sequentially weakly dense *in $W^{1,3}(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{S}^2)$.*

As a matter of fact, the topology and the nature of the manifold $\mathcal{M}$ is of little importance in the proof. We rely indeed on the construction of a counterexample in the special case $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{B}^4$, imposing however an additional condition on the boundary $\partial\mathbb{B}^4$.

Theorem 4. *There exists a map $\mathcal{U}$ is $W^{1,3}(\mathbb{B}^4, \mathbb{S}^2)$ which is not the weak limit in $W^{1,3}(\mathbb{B}^4, \mathbb{R}^3)$ of smooth maps between $\mathbb{B}^4$ and $\mathbb{S}^2$. Moreover the restriction of $\mathcal{U}$ to the boundary $\partial\mathbb{B}^4 = \mathbb{S}^3$ is a constant map.*

As far as we are aware of, this is the first case where *an obstruction to sequential weak density* of smooth maps between manifolds has been established when p is an integer. Theorem 3 also answers a question explicitely raised in [19, 20, 21].

Let us emphasize that the map $\mathcal{U}$ constructed in theorem 4 *necessarily must have a infinite number of singularities*, and is hence very different from the example $\mathcal{U}_{\text{sing}}$ provided in (2). Indeed, let us recall that, for $m - 1 \leq p < m$, the set of maps with a finite number of isolated singularities

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{B}^m, \mathcal{N}) = \{u \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^m, \mathcal{N}), \text{ s.t } \ u \in C^\infty(\mathbb{B}^m \setminus \{a_1, \dots a_\ell\}) \text{ for a finite set } \{a_1, \dots a_\ell\}\}. \tag{7}$$

is not only dense in $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^m, \mathcal{N})$ for the strong topology, but , in the case $p = m - 1$, is also contained in the sequentially weak closure of smooth maps with values into $\mathcal{N}$. The proof of this latest fact, given in [5, 6, 11] and which will be sketched in a moment, is actually inspired by a method introduced in the seminal work of Brezis, Coron and Lieb [12], and along the same idea the singularity of $\mathcal{U}_{\text{sing}}$ was removed using concentration of energy along lines connecting the singularity to the boundary, or possibly to other singularities with opposite topological charges. In view of (3), the energy of the approximating maps are controlled in the limit by a term which is of the order of the connecting lines, multiplied by a topological

[3] In several of these results, an additional boundary condition is imposed.

charge. This number, which is usually termed a defect energy, is obviously bounded when the number of singularities is finite, yielding hence the mentioned weak approximabilty of maps in $\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{B}^4,\mathcal{N})$ by smooth maps. We may however not a priori exclude the fact that, when approximating a map in $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^4,\mathcal{N})$ by maps with a finite number of singularities, the defect energy grows when the number of singularities grows. As a matter of fact, our strategy in the proof of Theorem 4 is to produce a map $\mathcal{U}$ for which this phenomenon occurs.

As this stage, it is worthwhile to compare, when the exponent p is equal to 3, the results obtained for the cases the target manifolds are $\mathbb{S}^2$ or $\mathbb{S}^3$. In both cases the homotopy groups are similar, since $\pi_3(\mathcal{N})=\mathbb{Z}$, for $\mathcal{N}=\mathbb{S}^2$ or $\mathcal{N}=\mathbb{S}^3$. However, we obtain, provided $\dim \mathcal{M}\geq 4$, sequentially weak density of smooth maps in the case $N=\mathbb{S}^3$ thanks to Theorem 2, whereas in the case $\mathcal{N}=\mathbb{S}^2$, we obtain exactly the opposite result, since there are obstructions to weak density of smooth maps in view of Theorem 4. Hence ultimately, not only the nature of the homotopy group matters, but also more subtle issues related to the way its elements behave according to the Sobolev norms and the E_3 energy.

In the next subsection, we review with more details the constructions mentioned above and emphasize its connection with optimal transportation theory.

1.2 Defect measures and optimal transportation of topological charges

We describe briefly how one may approximate maps in $\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{B}^4,\mathcal{N})$ weakly by smooth maps. Topological properties of maps from $\mathbb{S}^3$ to $\mathcal{N}$ are central in the discussion and we describe first some relevant issues.

Infimum of energy in homotopy classes. For a given continuous map φ from $\mathbb{S}^3$ to $\mathcal{N}$, we will denote by $[\![\varphi]\!]$ its homotopy class. When $\pi_3(\mathcal{N})=\mathbb{Z}$, each homotopy class in $C^0(\mathbb{S}^3,\mathcal{N})$ can be labelled by an integer which will will be termed *the topological charge* of the homotopy class or of its elements. Setting in this case, for d given in $\mathbb{Z}$

$$\nu_{\mathcal{N}}(d)\equiv \nu_{\mathcal{N},3}([\![\varphi]\!]) \text{ with } [\![\varphi]\!]=d,$$

We verify that $\nu_{\mathcal{N}}(-d)=\nu_{\mathcal{N}}(d)$ and that concentrating bubbles of topological charge ± 1 at$|d|$ distinct points, we have for $d\in\mathbb{Z}$

$$\nu_{\mathcal{N}}(d)\leq |d|\nu_{\mathcal{N}}(1) \text{ and more generally } \nu_{\mathcal{N}}(kd)\leq k\nu_{\mathcal{N}}(d) \quad \text{for } k\in\mathbb{N}. \tag{8}$$

A natural question is therefore to determine whether this lower bound *is sharp or not*. It turns out that the answer strongly depends on the nature of the target manifold $\mathcal{N}$.

Infimum of energy when $\mathcal{N}=\mathbb{S}^3$ and $\mathcal{N}=\mathbb{S}^2$. When $\mathcal{N}=\mathbb{S}^3$ the topological charge is called the *degree* and denoted $\deg(\varphi)$. It can be proved (see Section 2) that, for any $\varphi:\mathbb{S}^3\to\mathbb{S}^3$, one has

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^3}|\nabla\varphi|^3dx\geq |\mathbb{S}^3||\deg(\varphi)|,$$

so that, setting $\nu_3(d)=\nu_{\mathbb{S}^2}(d)$ we are led to the identity

$$\nu_3(d)=|\mathbb{S}^3||d|. \tag{9}$$

When $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{S}^2$, the topological charge is usually called the *Hopf* invariant and denoted in this paper $\mathbf{H}(\varphi)$. As we will recall in Section 2 (see (2.11)), one verifies easily that for any map $u : \mathbb{S}^3 \to \mathbb{S}^2$, we have the lower bound

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^3} |\nabla u|^3 dx \geq \mathrm{C}_0 |d|^{\frac{3}{4}}, d = \mathrm{H}(u). \tag{10}$$

In [26], Rivière made the remarkable observation that the bound on the left hand side is in fact optimal, that is, there exist a universal constant C_ν such that, for any d

$$\nu_2(d) \leq \mathrm{C}_\nu |d|^{\frac{3}{4}} \text{ where we have set } \nu_2(d) = \nu_{\mathbb{S}^2}(d), \tag{11}$$

so that the function ν_2 is actually sublinear on $\mathbb{N}$ and in other words, the minimal energy necessary for creating a map of charge d is no longer proportional to $|d|$, but grows in fact sublinearily as $|d|^{\frac{3}{4}}$. This fact has in turn important consequences on the way to connect optimally defect for maps in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{ct}}(\mathbb{B}^4, \mathbb{S}^2)$ and the definition of the corresponding defect measures[4].

Removing singularities of maps in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{ct}}(\mathbb{B}^4, \mathcal{N})$ *when* $\pi_3(\mathcal{N}) = \mathbb{Z}$. Consider next a map $v \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{ct}}(\mathbb{B}^4, \mathcal{N})$, the subset of $\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{B}^4, \mathcal{N})$ of maps which are constant on the boundary $\partial \mathbb{B}^4$. Given a singularity a of v, the homotopy class of the restriction of v to any small sphere centered at a does not depend on the radius, provided it is sufficiently small. We will denote $[\![a]\!]$ this element in $\pi_3(\mathcal{N})$ and in the case $\pi_3(\mathcal{N}) = \mathbb{Z}$, the number d labeling the homotopy class $[\![a]\!]$ will be referred to as a the *topological charge of the singularity* a. For sake of simplicity, we assume that v is constant on the boundary $\partial \mathbb{B}^4$ and also, at least in a first stage, that all singularities have either topological charge $+1$ or -1. We denote by $P_1, \ldots, P_r$ the singularities of charge $+1$ and $Q_1, \ldots, Q_r$ the singularities of charge -1: Since we assume that the map v is constant on the boundary, there is indeed an equal number of singularities of charge $+1$ and -1. In order to approximate weakly v by smooth maps, we adapt the idea of the proof of Proposition 1. For $i = 1, \ldots, r$, we consider bounded curves $\mathcal{L}_i$ joining the singularities of opposite charges, for instance P_i with Q_i, and construct a sequence of smooth maps $(\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$|\nabla \varphi_n|^3 \rightharpoonup |\nabla v|^3 + \mu_* \text{ as } n \to +\infty \text{ where } \mu_* = \nu_{\mathcal{N}}(1) \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^r \mathcal{L}_i \right), \tag{12}$$

so that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathrm{E}_3(\varphi_n) = \mathrm{E}_3(v) + \epsilon_* \text{ where } \epsilon_* = |\mu_*| = \nu_{\mathcal{N}}(1) \left(\sum_{i=1}^r \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{L}_i) \right). \tag{13}$$

The measure μ_* represents a defect energy measure for the convergence: the central issue for the weak approximation by smooth maps is therefore to bound its total mass. The value ϵ_* of the total mass of the defect measure given in (13) strongly depends on the position of the singularities and also on the way we choose to connect them. To obtain general weak approximation results, one would therefore need to choose somewhat optimal connections of the singularities and relate the defect energy to the Sobolev energy E_3. It turns out that this program can be completed in the case $N = \mathbb{S}^3$.

[4] in [19], the authors extend this discussion to several other targets.

Minimal connections for $\mathcal{N}=\mathbb{S}^3$. This notion has been introduced in the present context in [12]. Consider as above v in $\mathcal{R}_{\rm ct}(\mathbb{B}^4,\mathbb{S}^3)$, with topological charges ± 1 and constant on the boundary. In order to have the value of energy defect as small as possibly, it is natural to connect the singularities on strenght lines and to choose the configuration with the smallest total length. This leads to introduce the notion of length of a minimal connections between the points $\{P_i\}_{i\in J}$ and $\{Q_i\}_{i\in J}$ given by

$$\mathrm{L}\left(\{P_i\},\{Q_i\}\right)=\inf\left\{\sum_{i\in J}|P_i-Q_{\sigma(i)}|,\ \text{for } \sigma\in\mathfrak{S}\right\}, \tag{14}$$

where $J=\{1,\dots,r\}$ and $\mathfrak{S}$ the set of perturbations of J. In the language of optimal transportation, this can be rephrased as the optimal transportation of the measure $\sum\delta_{_{P_i}}$ to the measure $\sum\delta_{_{Q_i}}$ with cost functional given by the distance function. Going back to (13) we obtain hence

$$\epsilon_*=\epsilon_*(v)=|\mathbb{S}^3|\,\mathrm{L}(v) \text{ where } \mathrm{L}(v)\equiv\mathrm{L}(\{P_i\},\{Q_i\}) \text{ since } \mathbf{v}_{_{\mathcal{N}}}(1)=|\mathbb{S}^3|. \tag{15}$$

The important observation made in [12] (see also [1] for a different proof) is that the length of a minimal connection can be related to the energy of the map as follows

$$\mathrm{E}_3(v)\geq|\mathbb{S}^3|\mathrm{L}(v)=|\mathbb{S}^3|\,\mathrm{L}(\{P_i\},\{Q_i\}), \tag{16}$$

so that the defect energy $\epsilon_*(v)$ is bounded by

$$\epsilon_*(v)\leq\mathrm{E}_3(v). \tag{17}$$

Using the fact that $\mathcal{R}_{\rm ct}(\mathbb{B}^4,\mathbb{S}^3)=\{v\in\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{B}^4,\mathbb{S}^3),\text{s.t } v \text{ is constant on } \partial\mathbb{B}^4\}$ is dense in $W^{1,p}_{\rm ct}(\mathbb{B}^4,\mathbb{S}^3)$ we deduce, combining (12), (15) and (16) that maps in $C^\infty_{\rm ct}(\mathbb{B}^4,\mathbb{S}^3)$ are sequentially weakly dense in $W^{1,p}_{ct}(\mathbb{B}^4,\mathbb{S}^3)$. As a matter of fact, it can even be shown that our previous construct is in some sense optimal (see [7, 14, 15]): given any sequence $(v_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of maps in $C^\infty_{\rm ct}(\mathbb{B}^4,\mathbb{S}^3)$ converging weakly to v one has

$$\liminf_{n\to+\infty}\mathrm{E}(v_n)\geq\mathrm{F}(v)\equiv\mathrm{E}_3(v)+|\mathbb{S}^3|\mathrm{L}(v), \tag{18}$$

and as shown before, there are sequences for which optimality holds. It can be shown (see e.g [14]) furthermore that any sequence such that optimality holds behaves according to (12). Both functionals L and F, which is termed the relaxed energy of the problem (see [7]), are continuous in the space $W^{1,3}(\mathbb{B}^4,\mathbb{S}^3)$, F being lower-semicontinuous for the weak convergence.

Notice that we have argued so far as if all singularities have only topological charges of values ± 1: this is indeed not a restriction since the subset of $\mathcal{R}_{\rm cte}(\mathbb{B}^4,\mathbb{S}^2)$ maps with topological charges ± 1 is also dense. When $\mathcal{N}=\mathbb{S}^3$, multiplicities do not really affect the property of the functional L, it suffices to repeat each singularity in the collection according to its multiplicity.

Removing singularities of maps in $\mathcal{R}_{\rm ct}(\mathbb{B}^4,\mathbb{S}^2)$: branched transportation. The approximation scheme proposed in (12) is not optimal when the growth of $\mathbf{v}_{_{\mathcal{N}}}$ is sublinear. We illustrate this on the case $\mathcal{N}=\mathbb{S}^2$.

Let u be a given map in $\mathcal{R}_{\rm ct}(\mathbb{B}^4,\mathbb{S}^2)$, assuming as before that all topological charges are equal to ± 1. In order to approximate weakly u by smooth maps from $\mathbb{B}^4$ to $\mathbb{S}^2$ we connect again the positive charges $(P_i)_{i\in J}$ to the negative charges $(Q_i)_{i\in J}$. In contrast with the case $\mathcal{N}=\mathbb{S}^3$ however, straight lines joining positive charges to negative charges may however not be the optimal solution. Indeed, it may be energetically favorable, in view of the subadditivity property (11), that some parts of the connection carry a high topological charge and we need to introduce therefore branching points. Such a connection with branching points has been modeled by Q. Xia in his pioneering work [28] with the notion of *transport path*. We adapt here this notion and term it in our setting *branched connection*. A branched connection is given as a directed graph G, with vertex set $V(G)$, such that $\underset{i\in J}{\cup}\{P_i,Q_i\}\subset V(G)$, and a directed set $E(G)$ of segments joining the vertex: if e is a segment $E(G)$ then we denote by e^- and e^+ the endpoints of e, which by definition belong to $V(G)$. We assume furthermore that we are given a function $\mathrm{H}: E(G)\to\mathbb{N}^*$ such that for each vertex $a\in V(G)$ there is a balance equation

$$\sum_{e\in E(G),e^-=a}\mathrm{H}(e)=\sum_{\substack{e\in E(G)\\ e^+=a}}\mathrm{H}(e)+\begin{cases}1 \text{ if} & a\in\{P_i\}_{i\in J}\\ -1 \text{ if} & a\in\{Q_i\}_{i\in J}\\ 0 \text{ otherwise}\end{cases} \tag{19}$$

It such a function H exists, it is necessarily *unique*: in our context, the function $\mathbf{H}$ represents the topological charge carried through the segment e and relation (19) expresses a conservation of this charge at the vertex points, with a source provided by the topological charges at the point singularities $\{P_i,Q_i\}$. We denote by $\mathcal{G}(P_i,Q_i)$ the set of all graphs having the previous properties and introduce the quantity

$$\mathrm{L}_{\rm branch}(P_i,Q_i)=\inf\{W_2(G),G\in\mathcal{G}(P_i,Q_i)\},$$

where the functional $W_2(G)$ is the weighted length of the graph connection defined by

$$W_2(G)=\sum_{e\in E(G)}\boldsymbol{\nu}_2(\mathrm{H}(e))\mathcal{H}^1(e)\quad\text{for } G\in\mathcal{G}(P_i,Q_i). \tag{20}$$

As a matter of fact, we may notice at this point that $\mathrm{L}(P_i,Q_i)$ may be defined using the same framework as the infimum of the function $W_3(G)$ defined according to the formula (20) with $\boldsymbol{\nu}_2$ turned into $\boldsymbol{\nu}_3$: however a optimal connection will not require additional vertex points.

The functional $\mathrm{L}_{\rm branch}$ plays now a similar role for $\mathbb{S}^2$ valued maps as did the length of a minimal connection for $\mathbb{S}^3$ valued maps: it allows to measure the mass of the defect measure when approximating by sequences of smooth maps between $\mathbb{B}^4$ and $\mathbb{S}^2$. More precisely it has been proved in [19] that, if $(\varphi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of maps in $C_{\rm ct}(\mathbb{B}^4,\mathbb{S}^2)$ such that $\varphi_n\rightharpoonup u$ in $W^{1,3}(\mathbb{B}^4,\mathbb{S}^2)$, then

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\mathrm{E}_3(\varphi_n)\geq\mathrm{E}_3(u)+\mathrm{L}_{\rm branch}(P_i,Q_i). \tag{21}$$

Conversely one may construct such a sequence $(\varphi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that we have equality in (21), and then $\mathrm{L}_{\rm branch}(u)\equiv\mathrm{L}_{\rm branch}(P_i,Q_i)$ corresponds indeed to the mass of the defect measure. As in the case of the length of minimal connections L for $\mathbb{S}^3$ valued maps, the issue of weak density of smooth maps, in the case the target is $\mathbb{S}^2$, reduces in an essential way to the

comparison of the minimal weighted length of the graph connection $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{branch}}(P_i, Q_i)$ with the energy $E_3(u)$. The situation is however completely different from the case $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{S}^3$ as the next result shows.

Proposition 2. *Given any $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, there exists a map $\mathfrak{v}_k \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{Ct}}(\mathbb{B}^4, \mathbb{S}^2)$ such that*

$$\mathrm{E}_3(\mathfrak{v}_k) \leq \mathrm{C}_1 k^3 \tag{22}$$

and

$$\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{branch}}(\mathfrak{v}_k) \geq \mathrm{C}_2 \log(k) k^3 \text{ where } \Lambda(k) \to +\infty \text{ as } k \to +\infty, \tag{23}$$

and where $\mathrm{C}_1 > 0$ and $\mathrm{C}_2 > 0$ are universal constants.

This construction shows in particular that

$$\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{branch}}(\mathfrak{v}_k) \geq C(\log k)\, \mathrm{E}_3(\mathfrak{v}_k),$$

i.e. that the functional $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{branch}}$ is not controlled by the Dirichlet energy E_3. This property and the actual construction of the map $\mathfrak{v}_k$ is the heart of our argument and leads rather directly to the proof of Theorem 4.

1.3 Construction of $\mathfrak{v}_k$

The construction of $\mathfrak{v}_k$ is performed through three different steps. The first step is related to the construction of maps from $\mathbb{S}^3$ (or actually $\mathbb{R}^3$ through compactification at infinity, see details in subsection 2.1) to $\mathbb{S}^2$ which are close to be optimal for inequality (11). These maps from $\mathbb{R}^3$ to $\mathbb{S}^2$, denoted $\mathfrak{S}_k$ and termed in this paper k-spaghettons, carry a topological charge of order k^4, with an energy of order k^3. For the definition of $\mathfrak{S}_k$, we modify somewhat the original construction given in [26], and recast it into a more general framework known as the Pontryagin construction [25], see also [23] for a detailed presentation. The second step is a deformation denoted $\mathfrak{C}_k$ of $\mathfrak{S}_k$ on the strip $\Lambda = \mathbb{R}^3 \times [0, 30]$, which is such that the restriction of $\mathfrak{C}_k$ to $\mathbb{R}^3 \times \{0\}$ is equal to $\mathfrak{S}_k$ whereas its restriction to $\mathbb{R}^3 \times \{30\}$ is a constant function. We will term this map $\mathfrak{C}_k$ the Gordian cut of order k, because its construction involves a number of elementary operations on maps which are only allowed in specific Sobolev classes and are certainly *not* allowed for continuous maps. We have gathered some of these elementary operations in a separate section entitled the *Sobolev surgery toolbox*. Finally a third step transforms the map $\mathfrak{C}_k$ into $\mathfrak{v}_k$ and is far more elementary then the two previous ones.

1.3.1 The Pontryagin construction and the k-spaghetton map.

This construction, introduced first in [25], relates to a framed smooth m-dimensional submanifold of dimension in $\mathbb{R}^{m+\ell}$ a map from $\mathbb{R}^{m+\ell}$ to $\mathbb{S}^\ell$. By framed submanifold, we mean here that for each point a of the submanifold, we are given an orthonormal basis $\mathfrak{e}^\perp \equiv (\vec{\tau}_1(a), \vec{\tau}_2(a), \ldots, \vec{\tau}_\ell(a))$ of the ℓ-dimensional cotangent hyperplane at the point a, which varies continuously with the point a.

We specify next the Pontryagin construction to the case $m = 1$ and $\ell = 2$, which is the situation of interest for us. The framed manifold we consider is therefore a framed closed curve $\mathcal{C}$ in $\mathbb{S}^3$ or $\mathbb{R}^3$, for which we are given a orthonormal basis of its orthonormal plane

$\mathfrak{e}^\perp(\cdot) \equiv (\vec{\tau}_1(\cdot), \vec{\tau}_2(\cdot))$. This frame in turn induces a natural *orientation* of the curve, choosing the vector $\vec{\tau}_3(a) = \vec{\tau}_1(a) \times \vec{\tau}_2(a)$ as a unit tangent vector to the curve at the point a, so that *any framed curve is oriented*. Our next task is to map a small annular region around the curve to the sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$. To that aim, we present first an elementary ingredient which is the construction of a map from a small disk onto the sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$.

Mapping a disk to the sphere. We consider in the plane $\mathbb{R}^2$ the unit disk $\mathbb{D} = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2, x_1^2 + x_2^2 \leq 1\}$ and define a map χ from the disk $\mathbb{D}$ onto the standard two-sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$ by setting, for $(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$\chi(x_1, x_2) = (x_1 f(r), x_2 f(r), g(r)) \text{ with } r = \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2},\ r^2 f^2(r) + g^2(r) = 1, \tag{24}$$

where f and g are smooth given real functions on $[0, 1]$ such that

$$\begin{cases} f(0) = f(1) = 0,\ 0 \leq rf(r) \leq 1 \text{ for any } r \in [0, 1] \\ -1 \leq g \leq 1 \text{ and } g \text{ decreases from } g(0) = 1 \text{ to } g(1) = -1. \end{cases}$$

It follows from this definition what χ maps one to one the interior of the disk $\mathbb{D}$ to the set $\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \{\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}}\}$, where $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}}$ denotes the south pole $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}} = (0, 0-1)$. Moreover the boundary $\partial\mathbb{D}$ is mapped onto the south pole $(0, 0, -1)$, whereas the origin 0 is mapped to the North pole $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{north}} = (0, 0, 1)$. It is possible to choose the functions f and g so that ξ is "almost conformal".

Given $\varrho > 0$ we then define the scaled function χ_ϱ on $\mathbb{R}^2$ by setting

$$\chi_\varrho(x_1, x_2) = \chi(\frac{x_1}{\varrho}, \frac{x_2}{\varrho}),\ \text{for } (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{D}_\varrho,\ \chi_\varrho(x_1, x_2) = \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}} \text{ otherwise},$$

so that in particular

$$\|\nabla\chi_\varrho\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{D}_\varrho)} \leq C\varrho^{-1}. \tag{25}$$

Mapping an annular neighborhood of $\mathcal{C}$ to the 2-sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$. For $a \in \mathcal{C}$, let $P_a^\perp$ be the plane orthogonal to $\vec{\tau}_a$, and let $\mathbb{D}_a^\perp(\varrho)$ the disk in $P_a^\perp$ be centered at a of radius $\varrho > 0$. We consider the tubular neighborhood $\mathrm{T}_\varrho(\mathcal{C})$ of $\mathcal{C}$ defined by

$$\mathrm{T}_\varrho(\mathcal{C}) = \underset{a\in\mathcal{C}}{\cup} \mathbb{D}_a^\perp(\varrho). \tag{26}$$

Notice that there exits some number $\varrho_0 = \varrho_0(\mathcal{C}) > 0$ depending only on $\mathcal{C}$, such that, if $0 < \varrho \leq \varrho_0$ then all disk $\mathbb{D}_a^\perp(\varrho)$ are mutually disjoint. For given $a \in \mathcal{C}$ we set

$$\Psi_\varrho[\mathcal{C}, \mathfrak{e}^\perp](x_1\vec{\tau}_1(a) + x_2\vec{\tau}_2(a)) = \chi_\varrho(x_1, x_2) \text{ for any point } x \equiv a + x_1\vec{\tau}_1(a) + x_2\vec{\tau}_2(a) \in \mathbb{D}_a^\perp(\varrho),$$

which defines a smooth map $\Psi_\varrho[\mathcal{C}, \mathfrak{e}^\perp]$ from $\mathrm{T}_\varrho(\mathcal{C})$ to $\mathbb{S}^2$. Since $\Psi_\varrho[\mathcal{C}, \mathfrak{e}^\perp]$ is equal to $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}}$ on $\partial\mathrm{T}_r(\mathcal{C})$ we may extend this map to the whole of $\mathbb{R}^3$ setting

$$\Psi_\varrho[\mathcal{C}, \mathfrak{e}^\perp](x) = \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}} \text{ for } x \in \Omega_\varrho(\mathcal{C}) \equiv \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \mathrm{T}_\varrho(\mathcal{C}),$$

so that $\Psi_\varrho[\mathcal{C}, \mathfrak{e}^\perp]$ is now a Lipschitz map from $\mathbb{R}^3$ to $\mathbb{S}^2$. Since $\Psi_\varrho[\mathcal{C}, \mathfrak{e}^\perp]$ is equal to $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}}$ outside a bounded region and in view of (25), we have hence shown:

Lemma 2. *If $0 < \varrho \leq \varrho_0(\mathcal{C})$ then the map $\Psi_\varrho[\mathcal{C}, \mathfrak{e}^\perp_{\rm ref}]$ belongs to* $\mathrm{Lip} \cap C^0_0(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{S}^2)$*, where we have set*

$$C^0_0(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{S}^2) = \{u \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{S}^2) \text{ such that } \lim_{|x| \to +\infty} u(x) \text{ exists}\}. \tag{27}$$

Moreover, we have

$$|\nabla \Psi_\varrho[\mathcal{C}, \mathfrak{e}^\perp](x)| \leq C\varrho^{-1} \text{ for every } x \in \mathbb{R}^3, \tag{28}$$

where $C > 0$ is some constant depending possibly on the curve $\mathcal{C}$ as well as on the choice of frame $\mathfrak{e}^\perp$ of the orthonormal plane.

The case of planar curves. As a matter of fact, all curves $\mathcal{C}$ that will enter through the Pontryagin construction in the definition of the spaghetton map $\mathfrak{S}_k$ will be planar or be an union of planar curves. Moreover, they will lie in planes either parallel to the plane $P_{1,2} = (\mathbb{R}\vec{e}_3)^\perp = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ such that } x_3 = 0\}$ or to the plane $P_{2,3} = (\mathbb{R}\vec{e}_1)^\perp = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ such that } x_1 = 0\}$, where we set $\vec{e}_1 = (1, 0, 0)$, $\vec{e}_2 = (0, 1, 0)$ and $\vec{e}_3 = (0, 0, 1)$. For such curves, we are going to define a *reference framing* as follows. We first choose the orientation of the curves: Curves in $P_{1,2}$ and $P_{2,3}$ will be orientated trigonometrically, that is counterclockwise for the orthonormal bases $(\vec{e}_1, \vec{e}_2)$ and $(\vec{e}_2, \vec{e}_3)$ of $P_{1,2}$ and $P_{2,3}$ respectively. With this convention, we will denote by $\vec{\tau}_{\rm tan}(a)$ a unit tangent vector at the point a of the curve oriented accordingly. Second, we choose the first orthonormal vector $\vec{\tau}_1$ as

$$\vec{\tau}_1(a) = \vec{e}_3 \text{ for curves in } P_{1,2} \text{ and } \vec{\tau}_1(a) = \vec{e}_1 \text{ for curves in } P_{2,3}.$$

Finally, we set $\vec{\tau}_2(a) = \vec{\tau}_{\rm tan}(a) \times \vec{\tau}_1(a)$, so that $\vec{\tau}_2(a)$ is a unit vector orthogonal to the vector $\tau_{\rm tan}(a)$ included in the plane $P_{1,2}$ or $P_{2,3}$ respectively, and *exterior to the curve*. We consider the frame of the orthonormal plane given by

$$\mathfrak{e}^\perp_{\rm ref}(a) = (\vec{\tau}_1(a), \vec{\tau}_2(a)) \text{ for } a \in \mathcal{C}. \tag{29}$$

It has in particular the property that $(\vec{\tau}_1(a), \vec{\tau}_2(a), \vec{\tau}_{\rm tan}(a))$ is a direct orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{R}^3$. In order to simplify a little notation, we will often set

$$\Psi_\varrho[\mathcal{C}] = \Psi_\varrho[\mathcal{C}, \mathfrak{e}^\perp_{\rm ref}],$$

in the case $\mathcal{C}$ is a planar curve in affine planes parallel to $P_{1,2}$ or $P_{2,3}$ or a infinite union of such curves.

Homotopy classes of Pontryagin maps and the k-spaghetton. If $\mathcal{C}$ is a planar curve in $P_{1,2}$ or $P_{2,3}$ *framed with the reference frame* $\mathfrak{e}^\perp_{\rm ref}$ defined above then it turns out that the homotopy class of $\Psi_\varrho[\mathcal{C}, \mathfrak{e}^\perp_{\rm ref}]$ is *trivial*. There are at least two simple ways to make not trivial homotopy classes emerge from the Pontryagin construction. The first one is to twist the frame of the orthogonal plane to the curve, *a method which we will not use in this paper*. Instead topology may also emerge considering *planar curves as above which are linked*. Considering two sheaves of k planar curves which are linked and ajusting the parameter ϱ with k, we obtain what we will term the $k-$spaghetton map denoted $\mathfrak{S}_k$. It is defined in details in Section 3 (see definition (3.7)). We summarize some its main properties in the next proposition.

Proposition 3. *The k spaghetton $\mathfrak{S}_k$ is a smooth map from $\mathbb{R}^3$ to $\mathbb{S}^2$ such that $\mathfrak{S}_k(x) = \mathrm{P}_{\rm south}$ if $|x| \geq 17$ and $|\nabla \mathfrak{S}_k(x)| \leq \mathrm{C}_{\rm spg} k$, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$, where $\mathrm{C}_{\rm spg} > 0$ is a universal constant. Moreover we have*

$$\mathrm{H}(\mathfrak{S}_k) = 2k^4 \text{ and } \mathrm{E}_3(\mathfrak{S}_k) \leq \mathrm{C}_{\rm spg} k^3. \tag{30}$$

1.4 The Gordian cut

As mentioned, this represents the second step of the construction. Since, for $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, the Hopf invariant of $\mathfrak{S}_k$ is non zero, it is not possible to deform continuously with values into $\mathbb{S}^2$ the k spaghetton $\mathfrak{S}_k$ into a constant map. However, such a deformation becomes possible if we relax the assumption on continuity, and work instead in a Sobolev class allowing singularities. More precisely, we consider the strip Λ of $\mathbb{R}^4$ defined by

$$\Lambda = \mathbb{R}^3 \times [0, 30] = \{(x', x_4),\ x' \in \mathbb{R}^3,\ 0 \leq x_4 \leq 30\},$$

and consider maps $w : \Lambda \to \mathbb{S}^2$ such that the following three conditions are met:

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{E}_3(w, \Lambda) \equiv \displaystyle\int_\Lambda |\nabla w|^3 < \infty \\ w(x', 0) = \mathfrak{S}_k(x', 0) \text{ and } w(x', 30) = \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}} \ \text{ for almost every } x' \in \mathbb{R}^3 \\ w(x', s) = \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}} \text{ for every } x' \in \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ such that } |x'| \geq 30 \text{ and } 0 \leq s \leq 30, \end{cases} \tag{31}$$

the second condition making sense in view of the trace theorem and the boundedness of the energy stated in the first condition. We set

$$X_k = \{w : \Lambda \to \mathbb{S}^2 \text{ such that (31) holds}\} \ \text{ and } Y_k = X_k \cap \mathcal{R}(\Lambda, \mathbb{S}^2), \tag{32}$$

where $\mathcal{R}(\Lambda, \mathbb{S}^2)$ denotes the set of maps from Λ to $\mathbb{S}^2$ with finite E_3 energy, and which are smooth except at a finite number of point singularities. We prove:

Proposition 4. *There exists a map $\mathfrak{C}_k$ in Y_k such that $\mathfrak{C}_k$ has exactly k^4 topological singularities of charge $+2$ and such that*

$$\mathrm{E}_3(\mathfrak{C}_k) \leq 10\, \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{spg}}\, k^3. \tag{33}$$

If Υ^k denotes the set of singularities of $\mathfrak{C}_k$, then we have

$$A_0^h + k^{-1} \left(\bigcup_{i,j=1}^{k} \bigcup_{q,r=1}^{[\frac{k}{2}]} \{(i, j, q, 2r)\} \right) \subset \Upsilon^k \subset A_0^h + [0, 1]^3 \times [-2, 2], \tag{34}$$

where $A_0^h = (0, -1 - h, -\frac{1}{8}h, 4)$ and where for a given number $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $[s]$ denotes the largest integer smaller or equal to s.

The heuristic idea of the proof of Proposition 4 is to consider the x_4 variable as a time variable. Our deformation of the spaghetton maps then consists in moving parts of the fibers onto the other parts so that they are ultimately unlinked. However, in order to do so, crossings are inevitable, each of them yielding a singularity of $\mathfrak{C}_k$.

Introducing the discrete sets of points located on regular cubic grids given, for $m, k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $h > 0$ by

$$\boxplus_k^m = \{1, \dots, k\}^m \text{ and } \boxplus_k^m(h) = h \boxplus_k^m = \{hI, I \in \{1, \dots, k\}^m\}, \tag{35}$$

we observe that a consequence of (34) is that

$$\mathcal{H}(A_0^h) + \boxplus_{[\frac{k}{2}]}^m(h) \subset \mathcal{H}(\Upsilon^k) \text{ with } h = k^{-1}, \tag{36}$$

where $\mathcal{H}$ denotes the linear mapping defined by $\mathcal{H}(x_1, x_2, x_2, x_4) = (x_1, x_2, x_2, \frac{x_4}{2})$, so that Υ contains a regular grid of singularities: this observation is crucial, in particular in relation to the minimal branched connection and the result described in Appendix A.

The construction of the sequences of map $(\mathfrak{v}_k)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ described in Proposition 2 is then deduced rather directly modifying the maps $\mathfrak{C}_k$ constructed in Proposition 4 using a few elementary transformations as dilations or reflections. The energy estimate (22) for the map $\mathfrak{v}_k$ then follows immediately from the corresponding estimate for $\mathfrak{C}_k$.

1.4.1 Irrigability of a cloud of points

To complete the proof of Proposition 2, it remains essentially to establish estimate (23) for the branched transportation of the map $\mathfrak{v}_k$, whose value involves only the location of singularities of $\mathfrak{v}_k$. The main property which we will use in the proof of (23) is expressed in property (34) in Proposition 4 and in the corresponding counterpart for the map $\mathfrak{v}_k$ (see (5.1) for a detailed description). It shows that nearly a quarter of the total number of singularities of $\mathfrak{C}_k$ is located inside the a parallelepipedic shapes region $\tilde{\mathrm{B}}^0_{\mathrm{ox}} \equiv A^0_0 + \frac{1}{40}[0,1]^3 \times [-1,1]^2$ which does not depend on k and that moreover, there, the singularities are quite well separated. As a matter of fact, it follows from (34) that

$$\frac{1}{k^4}\left(\sum_{a\in\Upsilon^k\cap\tilde{\mathrm{B}}^0_{\mathrm{ox}}}\delta_a\right) \to \mathrm{c}_\Upsilon \mu_{_L} \text{ as k } \to +\infty, \tag{37}$$

where $\mathrm{c}_\Upsilon > 0$ is some universal constant and $\mu_{_L}$ denotes the Lebesgue measure. It turns out that, in view of (37), the behavior of the functional $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{branch}}$ as k growths is related to the irrigation problem for the Lebesgue measure, a central question in the theory of branched transportation. It has been proven in [13] (see also Devillanova's thesis or the general description in [4], in particular Chap 10 there) that the Lebesgue measure *is not irrigable* for the critical exponent $\alpha_c = \frac{3}{4}$. This result can be interpretated directly as the fact that the functional $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{branch}}$ growth more rapidly that the number of points at the power α_c, hence more rapidly then k^3. A lower bound for this divergence then directly yields (23), completing hence the proof of Proposition 2. As a matter of fact, we will rely on a precise lower bound of logarithmic form for this divergence which is established in a separate Appendix at the end of this paper.

1.5 On the proof of the main theorems

The map $\mathcal{U}$ described in Theorem 4 is obtained gluing together a infinite countable number of copies of scaled and translated versions of the maps $\mathfrak{v}_k$, for suitable choices of the integer k and the scaling factors. This gluing is performed in such a way that the energies sum up to provide a finite total energy whereas the values for the respective functional $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{branch}}$ do not: this is made possible thanks to (23), since the two quantities behave differently as k growths. The conclusion then immediately follows from the convergence (21) proved in [19, 21].

Concerning Theorem 3 the proof consist in adding additional dimensions to the previous constructing and is rather standard.

1.6 The lifting problem

As a by product of our method, in particular the construction of the spaghetton maps, we are able to address here some questions related to the lifting problem of $\mathbb{S}^2$-valued maps within the Sobolev context. Such question have already been raised and partially solved in [8, 19, 20]. The main additional remark we wish to provide in this paper is that the question is *not related in an essential way* to topological singularities, since our counterexamples do not have such singularities.

We next recall that maps into $\mathbb{S}^2$ and maps into $\mathbb{S}^3$ are deeply connected through a projection map $\Pi : \mathbb{S}^3 \to \mathbb{S}^2$ termed usually the Hopf map and which we describe briefly.

To start with an intuitive picture (but as we will see in a moment, this, picture is not completely correct) the sphere $\mathbb{S}^3$ is very close, at least from the point of view of topology, to the group of rotations $SO(3)$ of the three dimensional space $\mathbb{R}^3$, the sphere $\mathbb{S}^3$ may be in fact identified with its universal cover. Any rotation R in $SO(3)$ then yields an element on $\mathbb{S}^2$ considering the image by R of an arbitrary fixed point of the sphere, for instance the North pole $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{north}} = (0, 0, 1)$, so that we obtain a projection from $SO(3)$ to $\mathbb{S}^2$ considering the correspondance $R \mapsto R(P)$. The construction of the projection Π from $\mathbb{S}^3$ onto $\mathbb{S}^2$ is readily in the same spirit, but requires to introduce some preliminary objects.

Identifying $\mathbb{S}^3$ with $SU(2)$. Here $SU(2)$ denotes the Lie group of two dimensional complex unitary matrices of determinant one, i.e. $SU(2) = \{U \in \mathbb{M}_2(\mathbb{C}),\ UU^* = I_2 \text{ and } \det(U) = 1\}$ or

$$SU(2) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & -\bar{b} \\ b & \bar{a} \end{pmatrix},\quad a \in \mathbb{C}, b \in \mathbb{C} \text{ with } |a|^2 + |b|^2 = 1 \right\} \simeq \mathbb{S}^3. \tag{38}$$

The Lie algebra $su(2) = \{X \in \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{C}),\ X + X^* = 0 \text{ and } \mathrm{tr}(X) = 0\}$ of $SU(2)$ consists in traceless anti-hermitian matrices. A canonical basis of this 3-dimensional space, which is actually orthonormal for the euclidean norm $|X|^2 \equiv \det(X)$ is provided by the Pauli matrices

$$\sigma_1 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} i & 0 \\ 0 & -i \end{pmatrix},\quad \sigma_2 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},\quad \sigma_3 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We identify the 2-sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$ with the unit sphere of $su(2)$ for the previous scalar product:

$$\mathbb{S}^2 \simeq \{X \in su(2),\ |X|^2 = \det(X) = 1\}.$$

The Hopf map. The group $SU(2)$ acts naturally on $su(2)$ by conjugation: if $g \in SU(2)$, then

$$su(2) \ni X \mapsto Ad_g(X) \equiv gXg^{-1} \in su(2) \text{ is an isometry of determinant 1.}$$

Definition 1. *The map $\Pi : SU(2) \simeq \mathbb{S}^3 \to \mathbb{S}^2 \subset su(2)$ defined, for $g \in SU(2)$ by $\Pi(g) \equiv Ad_g(\sigma_1) = g\sigma_1 g^{-1}$ is called the Hopf map.*

Notice that $\Pi(g) = \sigma_1$ if and only if g is of the form

$$g = \exp(\sigma_1 t) = \begin{pmatrix} \exp it & 0 \\ 0 & \exp -it \end{pmatrix}$$

with $t \in [0, 2\pi]$. More generally, if g and g' are such that $\Pi(g) = \Pi(g')$, then $g' = g \exp \sigma_1 t$ for some $t \in [0, 2\pi]$, so that the fiber $\Pi^{-1}(u)$ is diffeomorphic to the circle $\mathbb{S}^1$ for every $u \in \mathbb{S}^2$. By the Hopf map, $SU(2)$ appears hence as a fiber bundle with base space $\mathbb{S}^2$ and fiber $\mathbb{S}^1$. Moreover, this bundle is not trivial, but twisted since $Id_{\mathbb{S}^2}$ *does not* admit a continuous lifting $\Phi : \mathbb{S}^2 \to \mathbb{S}^3$ such that $Id_{\mathbb{S}^2} = \Pi \circ \Phi$. Indeed, Φ is homotopic to a constant, but not $Id_{\mathbb{S}^2}$.

Projecting maps onto $\mathbb{S}^2$. Given any domain $\mathcal{M}$ and a map $\mathrm{U} : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{S}^3$, we may associate to this map the map $u : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{S}^2$ obtained through to the composition with the map Π, that is setting $u = \Pi \circ \mathrm{U}$. This construction works for a rather general class of maps, with mild regularity assumptions, for instance measurability. In particular, since Π is smooth, if U belongs to $W^{1,3}(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{S}^3)$, then the same holds for $u = \Pi \circ \mathrm{U}$ and the correspondence is smooth. This correspondence is of course not one to one. Indeed, given any scalar function $\Theta : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}$, then we have

$$u = \Pi \circ \mathrm{U} = \Pi \circ (\mathrm{U} \exp(\sigma_1 \Theta(\cdot))) .$$

Conversely, given two maps U_1 and U_2 such that $u = \Pi \circ \mathrm{U}_1 = \Pi \circ \mathrm{U}_2$ then there exists a map $\Theta : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathrm{U}_2 = \mathrm{U}_1 \exp(\sigma_1 \Theta(\cdot))$. The map Θ is often referred to as the gauge freedom.

Lifting maps to $\mathbb{S}^2$ *as maps to* $\mathbb{S}^3$. The lifting problem corresponds to invert the projection Π, which means that, given a map u from $\mathcal{M}$ to $\mathbb{S}^2$ in a prescribed regularity class, one seeks for a map U from $\mathcal{M}$ to $\mathbb{S}^3$, if possible in the same regularity class, such that $u = \Pi \circ \mathrm{U}$. The map U is then called a *lifting* of u. As seen in the previous paragraph, if a lifting exists, then there is no-uniqueness, since if U is a solution, then the same holds for the map $U \exp(\sigma_1 \Theta)$, where Θ is arbitrary scalar functions $\Theta : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}$ in the appropriate regularity class.

If $\mathcal{M}$ is simply connected, it can be shown that the lifting problem has always a solution in the continuous class, i.e. for any continuous maps u from $\mathcal{M}$ to $\mathbb{S}^2$ there exists a continuous lifting U from $\mathcal{M}$ to $\mathbb{S}^3$ of u such that $u = \Pi \circ \mathrm{U}$. As an example in the case $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{S}^3$, the identity from $\mathbb{S}^3$ into itself is a lifting of the Hopf map.

The fact that the lifting property holds in the continuous class allows to provide a one to one correspondance between homotopy classes in $C^0(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{S}^3)$ and $C^0(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{S}^2)$. Indeed, two maps u_1 and u_2 from $\mathcal{M}$ to $\mathbb{S}^2$ are homotopic if and only if their respective liftings U_1 and U_2 are in the same homotopy class. Specifying this property to the case $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{S}^3$, we obtain as already mentioned an identification of $\pi_3(\mathbb{S}^2)$ and $\pi_3(\mathbb{S}^3)$. On the level of Sobolev regularity, the picture is quite different. We will prove in this paper:

Theorem 5. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a smooth compact manifold. For any $2 \leq p < m = \dim \mathcal{M}$ there exist a map $\mathcal{V}$ in $W^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{S}^2)$ such there exist no map $\mathrm{V} \in W^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{S}^3)$ satisfying $\mathcal{V} = \Pi \circ \mathrm{V}$. Moreover $\mathcal{V}$ belong to the strong closure of smooth maps in $W^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{S}^2)$.*

This results supplements earlier results obtained on this question in [8, 19]. It is proved in [8] that, if $1 \leq p < 2 \leq \dim \mathcal{M}$, $p \geq \dim \mathcal{M} \geq 3$ or $p > \dim \mathcal{M} = 2$, then any map $\mathcal{V}$ in $W^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{S}^2)$ admits a lifting V in $W^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{S}^3)$, whereas a map was produced there in the cases $2 \leq p < 3 \leq \dim \mathcal{M}$ or $p = 3 < \dim \mathcal{M}$, which possesses no lifting in $W^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{S}^2)$. In the later case, however, the example produced in [8] is not in the strong closure of smooth maps, in contrast with the map constructed in Theorem 5. Notice that as a matter of fact, Theorem 5 gives a negative answer to open question 4 in [8], and that the only case left open is the case $p = \dim \mathcal{M} = 2$ corresponding to the open question 3 in [8].

1.7 Concluding remarks and open questions

As perhaps the previous presentation shows, the construction of our counterexample relies on several specific properties of the Hopf invariant, a topological invariant which combines in a very appealing way various aspects of topology in the three dimensional space. Our proof is built on the fact that the related branched transportation involves precisely the critical exponent, yielding a divergence in some estimates which are crucial. An analog for this exponent for more general manifolds with infinite homotopy group $\pi_p(\mathcal{N})$ has been provided and worked out in [20], based on some sophisticated notions in topology. It is likely that this exponent plays an important role in issues related to weak density of smooth maps. In the case the exponent provided in [20] is larger then the critical exponent of the related branched transportation, as described above, one may reasonably conjecture that there should exist some obstruction the sequential weak density of smooth maps. However the *effective* constructions of such obstructions, perhaps similar to the ones proposed in this work remain unclear. In particular the Pontryagin construction used here seems at first sight somehow restricted to the case the target is a sphere.

In another direction, let us also notice that most if not all results related to the weak closure of smooth maps between manifolds for integer exponents deal with manifolds having infinite homotopy group $\pi_p(\mathcal{N})$. The case when $\pi_p(\mathcal{N})$ is finite seems widely open and raises interesting questions also on the level of the related notions of minimal connections. As a first example, one may start again with $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{S}^2$, $p = 4$, for with we have $\pi_4(\mathbb{S}^2) = \mathbb{Z}^2$. In this case a nice description of the homotopy classes in terms of the Pontragyin construction is also available.

Besides these problems, we have singled out at the end of the Appendix a few questions which come up quite naturally from the description of branched transportation in the critical case and super critical case. These questions are of independent interest.

This paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we recall some notion of topology which are used in the course of paper. Section 3 is devoted to the construction of the k-spaghetton map, whereas in Section 4, we construct the Gordian cut $\mathfrak{C}_k$, providing the proof to Proposition 4, which is the central part of the paper. In Section 5, we provide the proofs of the main results, relying also on some results provided in Appendix A, in particular Theorem A.1, which, beside Proposition A.2, is the main result there.

2 Some topological background

We review in this section some basic properties of maps from $\mathbb{S}^3$ into $\mathbb{S}^2$ or $\mathbb{S}^3$.

2.1 Compactification at infinity of maps from $\mathbb{R}^3$ into $\mathcal{N}$

Whereas the emphasis was put in several places of the previous discussion on maps defined on the 3-sphere $\mathbb{S}^3$, it turns out that it is sometimes easier to work on the space $\mathbb{R}^3$ instead of $\mathbb{S}^3$. Since our maps will have some limits at infinity or even are constant outside a large ball, we are led to introduce the space

$$C^0_0(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^\ell) = \{u \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^\ell) \text{ s.t } \lim_{|x|\to\infty} u \text{ exists}\}$$

and define accordingly the space $C^0_0(\mathbb{R}^3,\mathcal{N})$. The space $C^0_0(\mathbb{R}^3,\mathbb{R}^\ell)$ may be put in one to one correspondance with the space $C^0(\mathbb{S}^3,\mathbb{R}^\ell)$ thanks to the stereographic projection St_3 which is a smooth map from $\mathbb{S}^3\setminus\{\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}}\}$ onto $\mathbb{R}^3$ and is defined by

$$\mathrm{St}_3(x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4)=\left(\frac{x_1}{1+x_4},\frac{x_2}{1+x_4},\frac{x_3}{1+x_4}\right).$$

It follows that, for any map $u\in C^0(\mathbb{S}^3,\mathcal{N})$ we may define $u\circ\mathrm{St}_3\in C^0_0(\mathbb{R}^3,\mathcal{N})$ and conversely given any map v in $C^0_0(\mathbb{R}^3,\mathcal{N})$ the map $v\circ\mathrm{St}_3^{-1}$ belongs to $C^0(\mathbb{S}^3,\mathcal{N})$. This allows to handle maps in $C^0_0(\mathbb{R}^3,\mathcal{N})$ as maps in $C^0(\mathbb{S}^3,\mathcal{N})$ and that we have a one to one correspondance of homotopy classes. In particular, when $\mathcal{N}=\mathbb{S}^3$ or $\mathcal{M}=\mathbb{S}^2$ we may define the degree in the first case or the Hopf invariant in the second for maps in $C^0_0(\mathbb{R}^3,\mathcal{N})$.

2.2 Degree theory

Degree theory yields a topological invariant which allows to classify homotopy class from $\mathbb{S}^3$ to $\mathbb{S}^3$. For a smooth U from $\mathbb{S}^3$ to $\mathbb{S}^3$, its analytical definition is given by

$$\deg\mathrm{U}=\int_{\mathbb{S}^3}\mathrm{U}^\star(\omega_{\mathbb{S}^3})=\frac{1}{(2\pi^2)}\int_{\mathbb{S}^3}\det(\nabla\mathrm{U})\,\mathrm{d}x, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\omega_{\mathbb{S}^3}$ stands for a standard volume form on $\mathbb{S}^3$ and U^* stands for pullback. It turns out that $\deg\mathrm{U}$ is an integer which is a homotopy invariant, that is, two maps in $C^1(\mathbb{S}^3,\mathbb{S}^3)$ which are homotopic have same degrees and conversely, two maps with the same degree are homotopic, leading as mentioned to a complete classification of homotopy classes. Notice that the degree of the identity map of $\mathbb{S}^3$ whose homotopy class is the generator of $\pi_3(\mathbb{S}^3)$ is 1. The area formula yields a more geometrical interpretation, namely

$$\deg u=\sum_{a\in u^{-1}(z_0)}\mathrm{sign}(\det(\nabla u)), \tag{2.2}$$

where $z_0\in\mathbb{S}^3$ is any regular point, so that $u^{-1}(z_0)$ is a finite set. Finally, an important property, which is quite immediately deduced from (2.1) is the lower bound

$$\mathrm{E}_3(\mathrm{U})\equiv\int_{\mathbb{S}^3}|\nabla\mathrm{U}|^3\geq|\mathbb{S}^3|\,|d|=2\pi^2|d|\quad\text{provided }\deg(\mathrm{U})=d. \tag{2.3}$$

This bounds is optimal. Indeed, as a consequence of the scale invariance of the energy E_3 in dimension 3, one may prove that for any $d\in\mathbb{Z}$

$$\boldsymbol{\nu}_3(d)\equiv\inf\left\{E_3(u),u\in W^{1,3}(\mathbb{S}^3,\mathbb{S}^3),\deg(u)=d\right\}=|\mathbb{S}^3||d|. \tag{2.4}$$

As above this number is an integer, and two maps with the same invariant are in the same homotopy class, yielding hence a complete classification of $\pi_3(\mathbb{S}^2)=\mathbb{Z}$.

2.2.1 The Hopf invariant

We next turn to maps u from $\mathbb{S}^3$ into $\mathbb{S}^2$ which are assumed to have sufficient regularity. Since in this case, there is a lifting $\mathrm{U}:\mathbb{S}^3\to\mathbb{S}^3$ such that $u=\Pi\circ\mathrm{U}$ the degree theory for $\mathbb{S}^3$ valued maps allows to classify also the homotopy classes of maps from $\mathbb{S}^3$ to $\mathbb{S}^2$. Set

$$\mathrm{H}(u)=\deg(\mathrm{U}).$$

This number, is called the Hopf invariant of u and as seen before classifies homotopy classes in $C^0(\mathbb{S}^3,\mathbb{S}^2)$. Notice that, since $\Pi = \Pi \circ \mathrm{Id}_{\mathbb{S}^3}$, the Hopf invariant of the Hopf map Π is $\mathrm{H}(\Pi) = 1$, so that its homotopy class $[\Pi]$ is a generator of $\pi_3(\mathbb{S}^2)$.

Integral formulations. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be simply connected, $\mathrm{U} : \mathcal{M} \to SU(2)$ sufficiently smooth and set $u \equiv \Pi \circ \mathrm{U}$. We construct a 1-form A with values into the Lie algebra $su(2)$ setting $A \equiv \mathrm{U}^{-1}d\mathrm{U}$. Conversely, given any sufficiently smooth $su(2)$ valued 1-form A on $\mathcal{M}$ also called a connection, one may find a map $\mathrm{U} : \mathcal{M} \to SU(2)$ such that $A = \mathrm{U}^{-1}d\mathrm{U}$, provided the zero curvature equation for connections holds, that is provided

$$dA + \frac{1}{2}[A, A] = 0. \tag{2.5}$$

Decomposing A on the canonical basis of $su(2)$ as $A = A_1\sigma_1 + A_2\sigma_2 + A_3\sigma_3$, we are led to the relations

$$du = U[A, \sigma_1]U^{-1} = A_3\sigma_2 - A_2\sigma_3,$$

so that the component A_2 and A_3 of A are completely determined by the given map u. On the other hand, A_1 is not, and may as a consequence be considered as a the gauge freedom already mentioned before. Indeed, for any sufficiently smooth function $\Theta : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}$, let $\mathrm{U}_\Theta(x) \equiv \exp(\Theta(x)\sigma_1)\mathrm{U}(x)$, so that $u = \Pi \circ \mathrm{U}_\Theta$ and $\mathrm{U}_\Theta^{-1}d\mathrm{U}_\Theta = \mathrm{U}^{-1}d\mathrm{U} + (d\Theta)\sigma_1 = A + d\Theta\sigma_1$.The values of A_2 and A_3 are left unchanged by the gauge transformation, and A_1 is changed into $A_1^\Theta = A_1 + d\Theta$. We notice also the relations

$$\begin{cases} u^\star(\omega_{\mathbb{S}^2}) = A_2 \wedge A_3,\ \mathrm{U}^*(\omega_{\mathbb{S}^3}) = A_1 \wedge A_2 \wedge A_3, \\ |dU|^2 = |A_1|^2 + |A_2|^2 + |A_3|^2 \text{ and } |du|^2 = (|A_2|^2 + |A_3|^2), \end{cases} \tag{2.6}$$

where $\omega_{\mathbb{S}^2}$ stays for the standard volume form on $\mathbb{S}^2$. The curvature equation (2.5) yields the relation

$$2dA_1 = A_2 \wedge A_3 = u^\star(\omega_{\mathbb{S}^2}), \tag{2.7}$$

so that dA_1 is also completely determined by the given map u. Going back (2.6) we may write

$$\mathrm{U}^*(\omega_{\mathbb{S}^3}) = A_1 \wedge u^\star(\omega_{\mathbb{S}^2}).$$

Specifying the discussion to the case $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{S}^3$, the integral formula for the degree yields in turn an integral formula for the Hopf invariant namely, for any map $u : \mathbb{S}^3 \to \mathbb{S}^2$, we have

$$\mathrm{H}(u) = \frac{1}{16\pi^2}\int_{\mathbb{S}^3} \alpha \wedge u^\star(\omega_{\mathbb{S}^2}),\ \text{with } d\alpha = u^\star(\omega_{\mathbb{S}^2}), \tag{2.8}$$

where actually α corresponds to the one form $\alpha = 2A_1^\Theta$, whatever choice of gauge Θ.

Choosing a good gauge. Recall that at this stage $d\alpha = dA_1^\Theta$ is completely determined by (2.7). To remove the gauge freedom we may seek to supplement this condition imposing a other one in order to obtain an elliptic system. Hence are led a impose a condition on $d^\star\alpha$, for instance

$$d^\star\alpha = 0,\ \text{and hence } \alpha = d^\star\Phi, \tag{2.9}$$

where Φ is some two form. In view of (2.7), (2.9) and the definition $\Delta = dd^\star + d^\star d$ of the Laplacian, we have the identity

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^3}\Phi = u^\star(\omega), \tag{2.10}$$

and hence Φ is determined up to some additive constant form.

Energy estimates and the Hopf invariant. By standard elliptic theory, we obtain the estimates

$$\|\alpha\|_{L^3(\mathbb{S}^3)} \leq C\|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^3(\mathbb{S}^3)} \leq C\|\nabla u\|^2_{L^3(\mathbb{S}^3)} \tag{2.11}$$

so that, going back to formula (2.8), we deduce that $\mathrm{H}(u) \leq C\|\nabla u\|_3^4$ and hence, as mentioned the lower bound (10) is readily an immediat consequence of the integral formula for the Hopf invariant. The fact that this lower bound is optimal is proved [26] and stated here as (11)(see also [3] for related ideas). It is far more subtle and relies on the identity

$$H(\omega \circ u) = (\deg \omega)^2 H(u). \tag{2.12}$$

for any $\omega : \mathbb{S}^2 \to \mathbb{S}^2$. Since this fact is somewhat central in our later arguments, let us briefly indicate how (2.12) may lead to the (11). A first elementary observation is that, given any integer $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ one may construct a smooth map $\omega_\ell : \mathbb{S}^2 \to \mathbb{S}^2$ such that

$$\deg(\omega_\ell) = \ell \ \text{ and } |\nabla\omega_\ell|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^2)} \leq C\sqrt{|\ell|}, \tag{2.13}$$

the idea being to glue together $|\ell|$ copies of de degree ± 1 maps scaled down to to cover disks of radii of order $\sqrt{|\ell|}$. set $\mathrm{u}_\ell = \omega_\ell \circ \Pi$. It follows from (2.12) and (2.13) that

$$H(\mathrm{u}_\ell) = \ell^2 \text{ and } |\nabla \mathrm{u}_\ell|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^2)} \leq C\sqrt{|\ell|}$$

so that

$$\mathrm{E}_3(\mathrm{u}_\ell) \leq C|\ell|^{\frac{3}{2}} \ \leq C|\mathrm{H}(\mathrm{u}_\ell)|^{\frac{3}{4}},$$

yielding hence the proof of (11), at least when the hopf invariant $d = \ell^2$ is a square. The spaghetton map which we will construct later is actually a slight modification of the map u_ℓ and enjoys essentially the same properties, as will be seen at the light of the next paragraph.

2.3 Linking numbers for preimages and the Pontryagin construction

Properties of the preimages of regular points yield another, very appealing, geometrical interpretation of the Hopf invariant which is somewhat parallel to (2.2) for the degree. Given a smooth map $u : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{S}^2$ in $C^0_0(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{S}^2)$ and a regular point M of $\mathbb{S}^2$, then its preimage $L_M \equiv u^{-1}(M)$ is a smooth bounded curve in $\mathbb{S}^3$. The curve L_M inherits also from the original map u a normal framing and hence an orientation. Indeed, consider an arbitrary point $a \in L_M$, that is such that $u(a) = M$. Since M is supposed to be a regular point, the differential $Du(a)$ induces an isomorphism of the normal plane $P(a) \equiv (\mathbb{R}\vec{\tau}_{\tan}(a))^\perp$ onto the tangent space $T_M(\mathbb{S}^2)$. If $(\overrightarrow{W}_{1,M}, \overrightarrow{W}_{2,M})$ is an orthonormal basis of $T_M(\mathbb{S}^2)$ such that $(\overrightarrow{W}_{1,M}, \overrightarrow{W}_{2,M}, \overrightarrow{OM})$ is a direct orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{R}^3$, then its image $\mathfrak{f}^\perp$ by the inverse $T = (Du(a)_{|P(a)})^{-1}$ is a frame of $P(a)$ which is not necessarily orthonormal. We define a framing on L_M, choosing the first vector $\vec{\tau}_1(a)$ of the frame as

$$\vec{\tau}_1(a) = \frac{T(\overrightarrow{W}_{1,M})}{|T(\overrightarrow{W}_{1,M})|}$$

and then $\vec{\tau}_2(a)$ as the unique unit vector orthogonal to $\vec{\tau}_1(a)$ such that $\mathfrak{e}_u^\perp \equiv (\vec{\tau}_1(a), \vec{\tau}_2(a))$ has the same orientation as $\mathfrak{f}^\perp$. A first remarkable observation (see [25, 23]) is that $(L_M, \mathfrak{e}_u^\perp)$ completely determines the homotopy class of u: Indeed, if $\varrho > 0$ is sufficiently small, then

$$H(u) = \mathrm{H}\left(\Psi_\varrho(L_M, \mathfrak{e}_u^\perp)\right).$$

A second important property is that the linking number $\mathfrak{m}(L_{M_1}, L_{M_2})$ of the preimages of any two regular points M_1 and M_2 on $\mathbb{S}^2$ is independent of the choice of the two points and equal to the Hopf invariant, that is

$$\mathfrak{m}(L_{M_1}, L_{M_2}) = \mathrm{H}(u). \tag{2.14}$$

Recall that the linking number of two *oriented curves* $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$ is given by the Gauss integral formula

$$\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_1} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_2} \frac{\overrightarrow{a_1 - a_2}}{|a_1 - a_2|^3} \cdot \overrightarrow{da}_1 \times \overrightarrow{da}_2. \tag{2.15}$$

Notice in particular that the linking number is always an integer, that it is symmetric i.e.

$$\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2) = \mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{C}_2, \mathcal{C}_1),$$

that its sign changes when the orientation of one of the curves is reversed and that $\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{C}_2, \mathcal{C}_1) = 0$ if the two curves are not linked. Moreover, in case of several connected components, we have

$$\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{C}_{1,1} \cup \mathcal{C}_{1,2}, \mathcal{C}_2) = \mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{C}_{1,1}, \mathcal{C}_2) + \mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{C}_{1,2}, \mathcal{C}_2). \tag{2.16}$$

In practice, as we will do, the linking number of two given curves can be computed as the half sum of the *signed crossing number* of a projection on a two dimensional plane.

2.4 The Hopf invariant of an elementary spaghetto

We go back to the Pontryagin construction and consider here the case the curve $\mathcal{C}$ is planar and connected. We may assume without loss of generally that $\mathcal{C}$ is included in the plane $P_{1,2}$. We assume moreover that it is framed with the reference frame $\mathfrak{e}_{\mathrm{ref}}^\perp$. In that case, the map $\Psi_\varrho[\mathcal{C}]$ will be called an *elementary spaghetto*. We first observe:

Lemma 2.1. *If* $0 < \varrho < \varrho_0(\mathcal{C})$ *then* $\mathrm{H}(\Psi_\varrho[\mathcal{C}, \mathfrak{e}_{\mathrm{ref}}^\perp]) = 0$.

Proof. The most direct proof is to use formula (2.14) considering the linking number of preimages of any two regular points. As a matter of fact, for the Pontryagin construction, all points are regular points, except the south pole $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}}$ whose preimage is the boundary of $T_\varrho(\mathcal{C})$, so that we may consider as regular points the North pole $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{north}}$ and the point M on the equator given by $M = (1, 0, 0)$. We have

$$L_{(\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{north}})} = \mathcal{C} \text{ whereas } L_M = \mathcal{C} + g^{-1}(0)\varrho\vec{e}_3,$$

where the function g is defined in (26). It follows that the two curves are parallel and hence nit linked so that in particular

$$\mathfrak{m}\left(L_{(\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{north}})}, L_M\right) = 0.$$

The conclusion then follows directly from (2.14). □

Remark 2.1. An alternate, perhaps more direct and more illuminating though also longer proof would be to construct *explicitely* a continuous deformation with values into $\mathbb{S}^2$ of $\Psi_\varrho[\mathcal{C}, \mathfrak{e}^\perp_{\rm ref}]$ to a constant map. The main step in this construction is to show that there exists a continuous map Φ from the exterior domain $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \mathcal{C}$ to $\mathbb{S}^1$ such that

$$\Phi\left(a + x_1\vec{\tau}_1(a) + x_2\vec{\tau}_2(a)\right) = \frac{(x_1, x_2)}{\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}} \text{ for any } a \in \mathcal{C} \text{ and } 0 < x_1^2 + x_2^2 \leq \varrho^2. \tag{2.17}$$

Assume for the moment that the map Φ is constructed and let us define the deformation. We set

$$F(x,t) = \left((1-t)\frac{\mathfrak{r}(x)}{\varrho} f\left(\frac{\mathfrak{r}(x)}{\varrho}(1-t)\right)\Phi(x),\, g\left(\frac{\mathfrak{r}(x)}{\varrho}(1-t)\right)\right) \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ and } t \in [0,1],$$

where the functions f and g have been defined in (24) and where the function $\mathfrak{r}$ is defined as

$$\begin{cases} \mathfrak{r}(x) = \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2} \text{ for any } x = a + x_1\vec{\tau}_1(a) + x_2\vec{\tau}_2(a) \text{ with } a \in \mathcal{C} \text{ and } 0 < x_1^2 + x_2^2 \leq \varrho^2, \\ \mathfrak{r}(x) = \varrho \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It follows from the properties of f and g that F is continuous from $\mathbb{R}^3 \times [0,1]$ to $\mathbb{S}^2$, that $F(\cdot, t)$ belongs to $C^0_{\rm ct}(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{S}^2)$ for any $t \in [0,1]$ and that

$$F(\cdot, 0) = \mathrm{H}(\Psi_\varrho[\mathcal{C}, \mathfrak{e}^\perp_{\rm ref}]) \text{ whereas } F(\cdot, 1) = \mathrm{P}_{\rm north},$$

yielding hence the desired deformation. The construction of the map Φ is obtained adapting the Biot and Savart formula, as done for instance in [2].

Remark 2.2. A first possible way to obtain not trivial homotopy classes through the Pontryagin constructing with planar curves, is to twist the frame. Consider a map $\gamma : \mathcal{C} \to SO(2) \simeq \mathbb{S}^1$, and consider the twisted frame $e^\perp_\gamma = \gamma(\mathfrak{e}^\perp_{\rm ref}) \equiv (\gamma(\cdot)(\vec{\tau}_1(\cdot)), \gamma(\cdot)(\vec{\tau}_2(\cdot)))$, where $\gamma(a)$ is considered as a rotation of the plane $(\tau_{\tan}(a))^\perp$. Since $\mathcal{C}$ is topologically equivalent to a circle, one may define a winding number of γ and prove, for instance using the crossing numbers, that

$$\mathrm{H}\left(\Psi_\varrho(\mathcal{C}, e^\perp_\gamma)\right) = \deg(\gamma).$$

In some places, we will denote, for given $d \in \mathbb{Z}$, by $e^\perp_{\mathrm{twist}=d}$ a framing which corresponds to a planer curves whose reference framing is twisted by a degree d map. As an exercise, the reader may construct a deformation showing that if $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$ are two planar curves which do not intersect and which are not linked then we may merge them into a single curve with a frame twisted by the sum of the twists so that

$$\mathrm{H}\left(\Psi_\varrho\left((\mathcal{C}_1, e^\perp_{\mathrm{twist}=d_1}) \cup (\mathcal{C}_2, e^\perp_{\mathrm{twist}=d_2})\right)\right) = d_1 + d_2. \tag{2.18}$$

2.5 The Hopf invariant of two linked spaghetti

Another simple way to obtain non trivial homotopy classes is to consider two linked planar curves, yielding what is often called a *Hopf link*. Consider therefore two planar curves without self-intersection, a curve $\mathcal{C}_1$ included in the plane $P_{1,2}$ of equation $x_3 = 0$ and a curve $\mathcal{C}_2$

included in the plane $P_{2,3}$ of equation $x_1 = 0$. To fixe ideas, on may take for $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$ the circles

$$\mathcal{C}_1 = \{(x_1, x_2, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^3, x_1^1 + x_2^2 = 1\} \text{ and } \mathcal{C}_2 = \{(0, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3, (x_2 + 1)^2 + x^3 = 1\}$$

so that the center of $\mathcal{C}_1$ is the origin, the center of $\mathcal{C}_2$ is the point $\mathrm{O}_2 = (0, -1, 0)$, both circles having radius 1. We choose for both circles the reference frames $\mathfrak{e}_{\mathrm{ref}}^{\perp}$ defined before and the corresponding orientation. They are obviously linked, and using the crossing numbers, we verify easily that

$$\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2) = 1.$$

We then set

$$\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2.$$

Lemma 2.2. *We have, for sufficiently small $\varrho > 0$,* $\mathrm{H}(\Psi_\varrho[\mathcal{C}, \mathfrak{e}_{\mathrm{ref}}^{\perp}]) = 2$.

Proof. We argue as in the proof of Lemma 2.1 an consider the pre-images $L_{\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{north}}} = \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2$ and $L_M = \mathcal{C}_1' \cup \mathcal{C}_2'$ of the North pole and the point $M = (1, 0, 0)$ of the equator respectively, where we have set $\mathcal{C}_1' = \mathcal{C}_1 + g^{-1}(0)\varrho\vec{e}_3$ and $\mathcal{C}_2' = \mathcal{C}_2 + g^{-1}(0)\varrho\vec{e}_1$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{m}(L_{\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{north}}}, L_M) &= \mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{C}_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2, \mathcal{C}_1' \cup \mathcal{C}_2') \\ &= \mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_1') + \mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2') + \mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{C}_2, \mathcal{C}_1') + \mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{C}_2, \mathcal{C}_2'). \end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

Since the curves $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_1'$ are parallel and hence not linked $\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_1') = 0$ and likewise $\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{C}_2, \mathcal{C}_2') = 0$. On the other hand $\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2') = \mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{C}_1', \mathcal{C}_2) = \mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2) = 1$ so that we obtain $\mathfrak{m}(L_{\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{north}}}, L_M) = 2$. Invoking (2.14) the conclusion follows. □

Remark 2.3. One may convince oneself of the previous result constructing directly a deformation of $\Psi_\varrho[\mathcal{C}, \mathfrak{e}_{\mathrm{ref}}^{\perp}])$. In that direction, one may first prove, using again the Biot and Savart law and arguing as in Remark 2.1 that

$$\mathrm{H}\left(\Psi_\varrho\left((\mathcal{C}_1, e_{\mathrm{twist}=1}^{\perp}) \cup (\mathcal{C}_2, e_{\mathrm{twist}=1}^{\perp})\right)\right) = 0.$$

and then deform the Pontryagin map related to the union of these two framed curves into the original one with the reference frame, together with the Pontryagin map associated to two planar curves, each having a +1 twist.

3 Linked k-spaghetton map

In this section, we extend the construction performed in Subsection 2.5 when each planar curve is replaced by a sheaf of such curves, each single curve being termed spaghetto below. In view of the construction of their later deformation $\mathfrak{C}_k$, we will impose their shape next.

3.1 Sheaves of stadium shaped curves

The curves with which we will perform the Pontragyin construction are stadium shaped, parallel on the straight part on the stadium, and nearly parallel on the round parts. Given an integer $k \in \mathbb{N}^\star$, the total number of spaghetti will be k^2 in each of the two sheaves $\mathfrak{L}_k$ and $\mathfrak{L}_\perp^k$ of our construction.

The sheaf $\mathfrak{L}_k$ of the k^2 stadium shaped curves $\mathfrak{L}^k_{i,j}$. We consider first two straight segments $\mathcal{D}^1_0$ and $\mathcal{D}^2_0$ parallel to $\vec{e}_1$ and included in the plane $P_{1,2}$ of equation $x_3 = 0$, each of length 10, given by

$$\mathcal{D}^1_0 = [-5,5] \times \{(0,0)\} \text{ and } \mathcal{D}^2_0 = [-5,5] \times \{(10,0)\}.$$

We complete these two segments as a stadium shaped curve $\mathfrak{L}_0$ contained in the plane $P_{1,2}$ defined by

$$\mathfrak{L}_0 = \mathcal{D}^1_0 \cup \mathcal{D}^2_0 \cup \mathcal{C}^+_0 \cup \mathcal{C}^-_0 \subset P_{1,2},$$

where $\mathcal{C}^+_0$ and $\mathcal{C}^-_0$ are two half circles of radius 5 in the plane $P_{1,2}$ of centers $(5,5,0)$ and $(-5,5,0)$ respectively, that is

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{C}^-_0 = (-5,5,0) + \mathbb{S}^{1,-}_5 \text{ and } \mathcal{C}^+_0 = (5,5,0) + \mathbb{S}^{1,+}_5, \text{ where for } r > 0 \\ S^{1,\pm}_r = \{(x_1,x_2,0) \in \mathbb{R}^3, x_1^2 + x_2^2 = r^2, \pm x_1 \geq 0\}. \end{cases}$$

We construct next a family of stadium shaped curves which are modelled according to $\mathcal{L}_0$ in order to form a sheaf of parallel curves. Let j,q be in $1,\dots,k$. We define the translates $\mathcal{D}^{k,1}_{j,q}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{k,2}_{j,q}$ of $\mathcal{D}^1_0$ and $\mathcal{D}^2_0$ respectively given by

$$\mathcal{D}^{k,1}_{j,q} = \mathcal{D}^1_0 - \frac{j}{k}\vec{e}_2 + \frac{q}{k}\vec{e}_3 \text{ and } \mathcal{D}^{k,2}_{j,q} = \mathcal{D}^2_0 + \frac{j}{k}\vec{e}_2 + \frac{q}{k}\vec{e}_3.$$

As before, we complete the two segments by half cercles in order to form as above a stadium. More precisely, we set

$$\mathfrak{L}^k_{j,q} = \mathcal{D}^{k,1}_{j,q} \cup \mathcal{D}^{k,1}_{j,q} \cup \mathcal{C}^{k,+}_{j,q} \cup \mathcal{C}^{k,-}_{j,q} \subset P_{1,2} + \frac{q}{k}\vec{e}_3,$$

where $\mathcal{C}^{k,+}_{j,q}$ and $\mathcal{C}^{k,-}_{j,q}$ are half circles of radius $r_j = 5 + \dfrac{j}{k}$ in the plane $x_3 = 0$ and of center $(5,5,0)$ and $(-5,5,0)$ respectively, that is

$$\mathcal{C}^{k,}_{j,q} = (-5,5,0) + \mathbb{S}^{1,-}_{r_j} \text{ and } \mathcal{C}^{k,+}_{j,q} = (5,5,0) + \mathbb{S}^{1,+}_{r_j}.$$

Notice that curves which distinct set of indices do not intersect. We finally consider the union of the k^2 curves $\mathfrak{L}^k_{j,q}$ obtained before, each contained in planes orthogonal to $\vec{e}_3 = (0,0,1)$, and set

$$\mathfrak{L}^k = \bigcup_{j,q}^{k} \mathfrak{L}^k_{j,q}.$$

Notice that the mutual distant between the individual spaghetti is bounded below by

$$\text{dist}(\mathfrak{L}^k_{j,q}, \mathfrak{L}^k_{j',q'}) \geq \frac{1}{k} \text{ for } (j,q) \neq (j',q'). \tag{3.1}$$

Moreover, going back to (26) we may observe also that, at least for large k we have

$$\varrho_0(\mathfrak{L}^k) \geq \frac{1}{3k}. \tag{3.2}$$

At this stage, the total linking number of $\mathfrak{L}^k$ is still equal to zero. In order to produce topology, we need to to define a second sheaf.

The sheaf $\mathfrak{L}^k_\perp$. We construct another sheaf of k^2 spaghetti $\mathfrak{L}^k_\perp$, all fibers parallel to the plane $P_{2,3}$ given the equation $x_1 = 0$, and *linked with each invidual spaghetto* of the sheaf $\mathfrak{L}^k$. Perhaps the simplest way to construct $\mathfrak{L}^k_\perp$ is to consider the linear transformation $\mathrm{T} : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^3$ which inverts the role of the variables x_1 and $-x_2$ and x_2 with x_3 defined by

$$\mathrm{T}(x_1, x_2, x_3) = (-x_2, x_3, x_1) \text{ for } (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3,$$

and to define the stadium $\mathfrak{L}^\perp_0$ included in the plane $P_{2,3}$ as

$$\begin{cases} \mathfrak{L}^\perp_0 = (0, 2, -5) + \mathrm{T}\mathfrak{L}_0 = (0, 3, -5) + \mathrm{T}\mathcal{C}^1_0 \cup \mathrm{T}\mathcal{C}^2_0 \cup T\mathcal{C}^3_0 \cup \mathrm{T}C^4_0 \\ \qquad\qquad = \mathcal{D}^1_{0,\perp} \cup \mathcal{D}^2_{0,\perp} \cup \mathcal{C}^+_{0,\perp} \cup \mathcal{C}^-_{0,\perp} \subset P_{2,3} \end{cases}$$

where

$$\begin{cases} D^1_{0,\perp} = \{0\} \times [3, -7] \times \{-5\},\ \mathcal{D}^2_{0,\perp} = \{0\} \times [3, -7] \times \{5\} \\ \mathcal{C}^+_{0,\perp} = (0, 3, 0) + \{(x_2, x_3),\ \ x_2 \geq 0 \text{ and } x_2^2 + x_3^2 = 25\} \text{ and} \\ \mathcal{C}^-_{0,\perp} = (0, -7, 0) + \{(x_2, x_3),\ \ x_2 \leq 0 \text{ and } x_2^2 + x_3^2 = 25\}. \end{cases}$$

Notice that, if the x_3 axis represents the vertical axis, then the segment $\mathcal{D}^1_0$, lies in between and is orthogonal to the two parallel segments $\mathcal{D}^1_{0,\perp}$, which is below, and the segment $\mathcal{D}^2_{0,\perp}$ which is above. The intersection of the two stadia is empty, i.e. $\mathfrak{L}_0 \cap \mathfrak{L}^\perp_0 = \emptyset$, and in fact

$$\mathrm{dist}(\mathfrak{L}_0, \mathfrak{L}^\perp_0) = 2.$$

Moreover $\mathfrak{L}_0$ and $\mathfrak{L}^\perp_0$ are linked. If their orientation is given by the standard reference framing $\mathfrak{e}^\perp_{\mathrm{ref}}$, then we are in the situation studied in subsection 2.5 so that their linking number is given by

$$\mathfrak{m}\left(\mathfrak{L}_0, \mathfrak{L}^\perp_0\right) = 1. \tag{3.3}$$

We next construct k^2 fibers $\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp}_{i,q}$ as in the previous paragraph modeled on the stadium $\mathcal{L}^\perp_0$. Let i, q be in $1, \ldots, k$. We define the translates $\mathcal{D}^{k,1}_{i,q,\perp}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{k,2}_{i,q,\perp}$ of $\mathcal{D}^1_{0,\perp}$ and $\mathcal{D}^2_{0,\perp}$ given by

$$\mathcal{D}^{k,1}_{i,q,\perp} = \mathcal{D}^1_{0,\perp} + \frac{i}{k}\vec{e}_1 - \frac{q}{k}\vec{e}_3 \text{ and } \mathcal{D}^{k,2}_{i,q,\perp} = \mathcal{D}^2_{0,\perp} + \frac{i}{k}\vec{e}_1 + \frac{q}{k}\vec{e}_3.$$

We complete the two segments by half-circles in order to form a stadium:

$$\mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}_{i,q} = \mathcal{D}^{k,1}_{i,q,\perp} \cup \mathcal{D}^{k,1}_{i,q,\perp} \cup \mathcal{C}^{k,+}_{i,q,\perp} \cup \mathcal{C}^{k,-}_{i,q,\perp} \subset P_{2,3} + \frac{i}{k}\vec{e}_1,$$

where $\mathcal{C}^{k,+}_{i,q,\perp}$ and $\mathcal{C}^{k,-}_{i,q,\perp}$ are half-circles of radius $r_q = 5 + \dfrac{q}{k}$ in the plane $P_{2,3} + \dfrac{i}{k}\vec{e}_1$ of centers $(\dfrac{i}{k}, 3, 0)$ and $(\dfrac{i}{k}, -7, 0)$ respectively, that is

$$\mathcal{C}^{k,+}_{i,q,\perp} = (\frac{i}{k}, 3, 0) + \mathbb{S}^{1,+}_{r_q\perp} \text{ and } \mathcal{C}^{k,+}_{i,q,\perp} = (\frac{i}{k}, -7, 0) + \mathbb{S}^{1,+}_{r_q,\perp},$$

where for $r > 0$ we define $\mathbb{S}^{1,\pm}_{r,\perp} = \{(0, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3, x_2^2 + x_3^2 = r^2 \text{ and } \pm x_2 \geq 0\}$. We set

$$\mathfrak{L}^{\perp,k} = \bigcup_{i,q=1}^{k} \mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}_{i,q}.$$

Notice that the intersection of two sheaves $\mathfrak{L}^k$ and $\mathfrak{L}^{\perp,k}$ is empty and that moreover

$$\operatorname{dist}(\mathfrak{L}^k, \mathfrak{L}^{\perp,k}) = 1. \tag{3.4}$$

Since each of the curves $\mathfrak{L}^k_{j,q}$ and $\mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}_{i,q}$ are planar curves which are either included in affine planes parallel to $P_{1,2}$ or to $P_{2,3}$ we may frame them with the reference frames $\mathfrak{e}^{\perp}_{\mathrm{ref}}$ which have been defined in Subsection 2.3. This yields, as we have also seen there, yields also a natural orientation of the curves. For instance, the curves $\mathfrak{L}^k_{i,j}$ are oriented counter-clokwise with respect to the frame $(\vec{e}_1, \vec{e}_2)$ and similarily the curves $\mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}_{i,q}$ are oriented counter-clokwise with respect to the frame $(\vec{e}_2, \vec{e}_3)$. Moreover, each given curve $\mathfrak{L}^k_{i_0,j_0}$ is linked to the k^2 curves $\mathfrak{L}^{\perp,k}_{i,q}$ with linking number 1 and each curve $\mathfrak{L}^{\perp,k}_{i_0 q_0}$ is linked with the k^2 curves $\mathfrak{L}^k_{i,j}$ with linking number 1. Concerning the total linking number, we have the linking number we have:

Lemma 3.1. *We have* $\mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{L}^k, \mathfrak{L}^{\perp,k}) = k^4$ *for any* $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. We have

$$\mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{L}^k, \mathfrak{L}^{\perp,k}) = \mathfrak{m}\left(\underset{j,q}{\cup}\mathfrak{L}^k_{j,q}, \underset{i,q'}{\cup}\mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}_{i,q'}\right) = \sum_{j,q}\sum_{j,q'}\mathfrak{m}\left(\mathfrak{L}^k_{j,q}, \mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}_{i,q'}\right) = k^4\mathfrak{m}\left(\mathfrak{L}_0, \mathfrak{L}^{\perp}_0\right),$$

and the conclusion follows from the identity (3.3). □

Finally we set

$$\mathcal{S}^k = \mathfrak{L}^k \cup \mathfrak{L}^{\perp,k}. \tag{3.5}$$

It follows from (3.2) and (3.4) that

$$\varrho_0(\mathcal{S}^k) \geq \frac{1}{3k} \text{ and } \mathcal{S}^k \subset \mathbb{B}(16). \tag{3.6}$$

3.2 Defining the k-spaghetton map $\mathfrak{S}_k$

Choosing $\varrho_k = 10^{-3} r_0(\mathcal{S}^k)$ we define the k-spaghetton map $\mathfrak{S}_k$ as

$$\mathfrak{S}_k = \Psi_{\varrho_k}[\mathcal{S}^k, \mathfrak{e}^{\perp}_{\mathrm{ref}}]. \tag{3.7}$$

Some of its relevant properties have been summarized in Proposition 3 in the introduction, which we prove next.

Proof of Proposition 3. The first assertion concerning the support of $\mathfrak{S}_k$ follows from the inclusion given in (3.6), whereas the second, the bound on the gradient, is an immediate consequence of (25). Since all fibers have the same shape, which does not depend on k, the constant $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{spg}}$ involved in the gradient estimate does not depend on k either. Turning to (30), the computation of $\mathrm{H}(\mathfrak{S}_k)$ follows the same lines as the proof of Lemma 2.2, considering the pre-images

$$L_{\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{north}}} = \mathcal{S}^k = \mathfrak{L}_k \cup \mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp} \text{ and } L_M = (\mathfrak{L}^k + g^{-1}(0)\varrho\vec{e}_3) \cup (\mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp} + g^{-1}(0)\varrho\vec{e}_1)$$

of the North pole and the point $M = (1, 0, 0)$ of the equator respectively. Arguing as in (2.19), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{m}(L_{\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{north}}}, L_M) &= \mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{L}_k \cup \mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}, \mathfrak{L}_k + g^{-1}(0)\varrho\vec{e}_3) \cup (\mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp} + g^{-1}(0)\varrho\vec{e}_1) \\ &= 2\mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{L}^k, \mathfrak{L}^{\perp,k}).\end{aligned}$$

For the second estimate in (30), we observe that, since the support of $|\nabla\mathfrak{S}_k|$ is included in a ball independently of k, it suffices to integrate the uniform bound of the gradient to obtain the result.

Remark 3.1. An alternate proof may actually be derived from Proposition 4 in the next section.

□

4 Untying the spaghetton map $\mathfrak{S}_k$: the gordian cut $\mathfrak{C}_k$

The proof of Proposition 4 is somewhat technical, its completion will be given at the end of this Section. The heuristic idea is however rather simple: we wish to push down along the x_3-axis the sheaf $\mathfrak{L}^k_\perp$, keeping however its shape essentially unchanged, whereas the sheaf $\mathfrak{L}^k$ does not move. This presents no major difficulty, pushing along a simple vector-field as long as the sheaf $\mathfrak{L}^k_\perp$ does not encounter the sheaf $\mathfrak{L}^k$. When the two sheafs touch, we take advantage of the fact that we are working in a Sobolev class were singularities are allowed: Using such singularities, the sheaf $\mathfrak{L}^k_\perp$ is enabled to follow his way and to pass through the fibers of $\mathfrak{L}^k$, creating on the way point singularities. These singularities form a cloud of uniformly distributed points, at least in the center of the cloud.

In order to provide a sound mathematical meaning to the previous construction, in particular the crossing of fibers, we single out next a a few elementary tools which are used extensively in the proof of Proposition 4 and which are part of what could be called a *Sobolev surgery toolbox*.

4.1 Sobolev surgery toolbox

4.1.1 Gluing

This is the most elementary operation. Assume first that we are given two subdomains Ω_1 and Ω_2 of a domain Ω_0 of $\mathbb{R}^3$ such that $\bar\Omega_1 \cap \bar\Omega_2 = \emptyset$ and let v_1 and v_2 be two functions with values into $\mathbb{S}^2$ such that $v_1(x) = \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}}$ for $x \in \Omega_0 \setminus \Omega_1$ and $v_2(x) = \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}}$ for $x \in \Omega_0 \setminus \Omega_2$. Then we may define the function $v_1 \vee_3 v_2$ on Ω_0 by

$$\begin{cases} v_1 \vee_3 v_2(x) = v_1(x) \text{ for } x \in \Omega_1,\ v_1 \vee_3 v_2(x) = v_2(x) \text{ for } x \in \Omega_2 \\ v_1 \vee_3 v_2(x) = \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}} \text{ for } x \in \Omega_0 \setminus (\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2), \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

an alternate and even simpler definition being

$$v_1 \vee_3 v_2(x) = v_1(x) + v_2(x) - \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}} \ \text{ for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

In the case both v_1 and v_2 have bounded E_3 energy, then the same holds for $v_1 \vee_3 v_2$ with

$$\mathrm{E}_3(v_1 \vee_3 v_2) = \mathrm{E}_3(v_1) + \mathrm{E}_3(v_2). \tag{4.2}$$

A related situation is encountered in the case $\Omega_2 = \Omega_0 \setminus \Omega_1$, when both v_1 and v_2 have bounded E_3 energy. If the domains are sufficiently smooth, then one may define thanks to the trace Theorem the restrictions $v_{i|_{\partial\Omega_i}}$ for $i = 1, 2$ and if

$$v_1(x) = v_2(x) \text{ for } x \in \partial\Omega_1 \subset \partial\Omega_2 = \partial\Omega_1 \cup \partial\Omega_0$$

then we may define again $v_1 \vee_3 v_2$ according to (4.1) and relation (4.2) still holds. We notice that with this notation, we have, given two disjoint oriented compact framed curves in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and provided $\varrho > 0$ is sufficiently small

$$\Psi_\varrho[(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathfrak{e}^\perp) \cup (\mathcal{C}_2, \mathfrak{e}^\perp)] = \Psi_\varrho[\mathcal{C}_1, \mathfrak{e}^\perp] \vee_3 \Psi_\varrho[\mathcal{C}_2, \mathfrak{e}^\perp]$$

so that in particular

$$\mathfrak{S}_k = \left(\bigvee_{j,q=1}^{k}{}_3 \Psi_{\varrho_k}[\mathcal{L}^k_{j,q}, \mathfrak{e}^\perp_{\mathrm{ref}}] \right) \vee_3 \left(\bigvee_{i,q=1}^{k}{}_3 \Psi_{\varrho_k}[\mathcal{L}^{\perp,k}_{i,q}, \mathfrak{e}^\perp_{\mathrm{ref}}] \right) \equiv \mathfrak{S}^\star_k \vee_3 \mathfrak{S}^\perp_k.$$

Finally, when we refer to similar gluing in $\mathbb{R}^4$, we will use replace the symbol $\vee_3$ by the symbol $\vee_4$.

4.1.2 Deformations

The deformations we have in mind in this subsection are generated by deformations of the domain $\mathbb{R}^3$ induced by the integration of a vector field, the x_4 variable playing the role of a *time variable*. More precisely, given a smooth vector field $\vec{X}$ on $\mathbb{R}^3$, we consider the flow Φ generated by the vector field $\vec{X}$ defined by

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Phi(\cdot, t) = \vec{X}[\Phi(\cdot, t)], \ \Phi(\cdot, 0) = \mathrm{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^3}, \tag{4.3}$$

so that, for each fixed time $t \geq 0$ the map $\Phi(\cdot, t)$ is a diffeomorphism of $\mathbb{R}^3$. We denote by $\Phi^{-1}(\cdot, t)$ its inverse at time t, so that actually we have $\Phi^{-1}(\cdot, t) = \Phi(\cdot, -t)$. The deformation of the domain gives rise also to corresponding deformations of general functions: to each function v on $\mathbb{R}^3$ and given $t \geq 0$, we may relate a function $v_t(\cdot)$ defined by

$$v_t(x) = v(\Phi^{-1}(x, t)) \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}^3,$$

The curve $t \mapsto v_t$ is now a continuous deformation of the initial function v, since $v_0 = v$. We implement this idea to our needs, with a very specific choice of vector field $\vec{X}$. Since our aim is to push the sheave $\mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}$ down according to x_3-direction with an intensity depending only on the x_1 and x_2 variables we will restrict ourselves to vector fields $\vec{X}$ of the form

$$\vec{X}(x_1, x_2, x_3) = -\zeta(x_1, x_2, x_3)\vec{e}_3,$$

where ζ is a given non-negative function. The integral curves are therefore vertical lines and the flow is immediately integrated as

$$\Phi(x_1, x_2, x_3, t) = (x_1, x_2, x_3) - \left(\int_0^t \zeta(x_1, x_2, x_3 + \Phi_3(x_1, x_2, x_3, s))ds \right) \vec{e}_3 \tag{4.4}$$

yielding also a similar identity for $\Phi^{-1}(\cdot,t)$, changing t into $-t$. It follows from (4.3) and its differentation according to the variable x_i that

$$|\frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial t}| \leq \|\zeta\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \text{ and } |\frac{\partial}{\partial t}[|\nabla\Phi|^2]| \leq C\|\nabla\zeta\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)}|\nabla\Phi|^2, \tag{4.5}$$

so that by integration we obtain

$$|\nabla\Phi|^2(\cdot,t) \leq C\exp\left(C\|\nabla\zeta\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)}t\right). \tag{4.6}$$

We introduce an extension operator $\mathcal{P}_\zeta$ which relates to an arbitrary map $v:\mathbb{R}^3\to\mathbb{R}^\ell$ and $t\geq 0$ the map $P_\zeta(v)(t)$ defined on $\mathbb{R}^3$ by the formula, for $(x_1,x_2,x_3)\in\mathbb{R}^3$ and $t\in\mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{P}_\zeta(v)(t)(x_1,x_2,x_3) = v_t(x_1,x_2,x_3) = v(\Phi^{-1}(x_1,x_2,x_3,t)) = v(\Phi(x_1,x_2,x_3,-t)) \\ \qquad\qquad = v\left(x_1,x_2,\left(x_3+\displaystyle\int_0^t \zeta(x_1,x_2,x_3,\Phi_3(x_1,x_2,x_3,s)ds\right)\right). \end{cases} \tag{4.7}$$

In the special case the function ζ does not depend on x_3 t, we then have $v_t = v(x+\zeta(x_1,x_2)t\vec{e}_3$.

As a direct consequence of the chain rule and (4.6), we obtain the following:

Lemma 4.1. *Assume that v and ζ are differentiable. Then we have for $x\in\mathbb{R}^3$ and $t\geq 0$*

$$\begin{cases} |\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\mathcal{P}_\zeta(v)(t)(x)| \leq C\|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)}\|\zeta\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ |\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^3}\mathcal{P}_\zeta(v)(t)(x)| \leq C\|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)}\exp\left(C\|\nabla\zeta\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)}t\right), \end{cases}$$

where $C>0$ is some universal constant.

We also consider the transportation of subsets of $\mathbb{R}^3$ by the flow. We set accordingly for subset $A\subset\mathbb{R}^3$ and $t\geq 0$

$$\mathcal{P}_\zeta(A)(t) = \{x\in\mathbb{R}^3, \Phi^{-1}(x,t)\in A\}. \tag{4.8}$$

Notice that, if $\mathcal{C}$ is a closed curve of $\mathbb{R}^3$, then in general

$$\mathcal{P}_\zeta\left(\Psi_\varrho[\mathcal{C}]\right)(x,t) \neq \Psi_\varrho(\mathcal{P}_\zeta(\mathcal{C},t)(x) \text{ for } x\in\mathbb{R}^3 \text{ and } t\geq 0, \tag{4.9}$$

but equality holds in case ζ is a constant function.

In most places of our construction, the deformation will not be performed on the whole on $\mathbb{R}^3$ but on subdomains. The typical situation we have to handle is the case of two domains Ω_0 and Ω_1 such that $\bar{\Omega}_0 \subsetneqq \Omega_1$ and maps v defined on Ω_1 such that $v = \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}}$ on $\Omega_1\setminus\Omega_0$. Given a function ζ as above, we introduce the stopping time

$$\mathfrak{T}(\zeta,\Omega_0,\Omega_1) = \inf\{t\geq 0, \Phi(x,t)\in\Omega_0, \text{ for some } x\in\Omega_1\},$$

where Φ denotes the flow related to ζ and the corresponding vector field. For $0\leq x_4\leq \mathfrak{T}(\zeta,\Omega_0,\Omega_1)$ we may then define $(\mathcal{P}_\zeta)(v)(x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4)$ according to formula (4.7) in the case $\Phi^{-1}(x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4)$ belongs to Ω_1 and $(\mathcal{P}_\zeta)(v)(x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4) = \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}}$ otherwise.

4.1.3 Cubic extensions

Whereas the previous construction works for quite general classes of maps and are hence not specific to the Sobolev framework, the extension method presented here induces singularities and hence is specially appropriate in the Sobolev setting. For that purpose, we consider the ∞ norm on $\mathbb{R}^4$ given by

$$|x|_\infty = \sup_{i=1,\dots,4} |x_1| \text{ for } x = (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in \mathbb{R}^4$$

and the corresponding ∞-sphere Q_r^4 of radius $r > 0$ defined by

$$\mathrm{Q}_r^4 = \mathrm{Q}_r^4(0) \text{ where more generally } \mathrm{Q}_r^4(a) \equiv \{x \in \mathbb{R}^4, |x-a|_\infty < r\} \text{ for } a \in \mathbb{R}^4,$$

so that actually Q_r^4 corresponds the hypercube $\mathrm{Q}_r^4 = [-r, r]^4$. The sides of Q_r^4 are included in the hyperplanes $x_i = \pm r$, where $i = 1, \dots, 4$. Given a map v defined on the boundary $\partial \mathrm{Q}_r^4(a)$ of a cube $\mathrm{Q}_r^4(a)$ we consider its cubic-radial extension on the full cube $\mathrm{Q}_r^4(a)$ given by

$$\mathfrak{E}\mathrm{xt}_{r,a}(v)(x) = v\left(a + r\frac{x-a}{|x-a|_\infty}\right) \text{ for } x \in \mathrm{Q}_r^4(a)., \tag{4.10}$$

So that $\mathfrak{E}\mathrm{xt}_{r,a}(v) = v$ on the boundary $\partial \mathrm{Q}_r^4(a)$. If the map v has finite energy E_3 on the three-dimensional set $\partial \mathrm{Q}_r^4(a)$, then the same assertion holds for its extension $\mathfrak{E}\mathrm{xt}_{r,a}(v)$ on the cube $\mathrm{Q}_r^4(a)$ with the estimate

$$\mathrm{E}_3\left(\mathfrak{E}\mathrm{xt}_{r,a}(v),\, \mathrm{Q}_r^4(a)\right) \leq \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{ext}}\, r\mathrm{E}_3(v, \partial \mathrm{Q}_r^4(a)). \tag{4.11}$$

4.1.4 Creating Hopf singularities through the crossing of lines

We analyze in this subsection a situation which appears in our construction of $\mathfrak{C}_k$ and accounts for the creation of Hopf singularities. We start the presentation with some general consideration concerning the boundaries of cubes.

Decomposing the boundary of the cube $\mathrm{Q}_r^4(a)$ *into faces.* Given a 4-dimensional hypercube $\mathrm{Q}_r^4(a)$, its boundary $\partial \mathrm{Q}_r^4(a)$ is the union of 8 distinct three-dimensional cubes $\mathfrak{Q}_p^{3,\pm}(r, a)$ of size r defined, for $a = (a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$ and $p = 1, \dots 4$ by

$$\mathfrak{Q}_p^{3,\pm}(r, a) = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in \mathbb{R}^4, x_p = a_p \pm r, \sup_{i \neq \mathrm{p}} |x_i - a_i| < r\}. \tag{4.12}$$

Hence, we have

$$\partial \mathrm{Q}_r^4(a) = \bigcup_{p=1}^{4} \left(\mathfrak{Q}_p^{3,+}(r, a) \cup \mathfrak{Q}_p^{3,-}(r, a)\right).$$

We assume for simplicity for the rest of the discussion that $a = (0, 0, 0, 0)$.

Some curves in Q_r^3. We consider here some curves entering later in Pontryagin construction and work therefore first in three dimensions, in particular the three-dimensional cube $\mathrm{Q}_r^3 = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3, |x_i| \leq r,\, i = 1, 2, 3\} = [-r, r]^3$. We consider the two segments of Q_r^3 given by

$$\mathrm{D}_{0,r} = \{(x_1, 0, \frac{1}{4}), -r \leq x_1 \leq r\} \text{ and } \mathrm{D}_{\perp,r}^- = \{(0, x_2, -\frac{3\,r}{4}), -r \leq x_2 \leq r\},$$

so that $\mathrm{D}_{0,r} \subset P_{1,2} + 1/4\vec{e}_3$ and $\mathrm{D}^-_{\perp,r} \subset P_{2,3}$. We consider also the smooth curve $\mathcal{C}^+_{\perp,r}$ given as the following graph in the plane $P_{2,3}$

$$\mathcal{C}^+_{\perp,r} = \left\{ \left(0, x_2, \mathfrak{g}\,(\frac{x_2}{r})\right), -r \leq x_2 \leq r \right\}, \tag{4.13}$$

where $\mathfrak{g} : [-1,1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is some given smooth function[5] such that

$$\begin{cases} \mathfrak{g}(s) = \mathfrak{g}(-s) \text{ for } s \in [-1,1] \text{ and } \mathfrak{g} \text{ is non-increasing on } \ [0,1] \\ \mathfrak{g}(0) \geq \dfrac{1}{2},\ \mathfrak{g}(s) = -\dfrac{3}{4} \text{ on } [\dfrac{1}{2}, 1] \text{ and hence } \mathfrak{g}(s) = -\dfrac{3}{4} \text{ on } [-1, -\dfrac{1}{2}]. \end{cases} \tag{4.14}$$

It follows from this definition $\mathcal{C}^+_{\perp,r}$ is included two dimensional plane $P_{2,3}$ which also contains the segment $\mathrm{D}^-_{\perp,r}$ and that its intersection with $\mathrm{D}^-_{\perp,r}$ is not empty, since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{D}^-_{\perp,r} \cap \mathcal{C}^+_{\perp,r} &= \{(0, x_2, -\frac{3\,r}{4}), -r \leq x_2 \leq \frac{r}{2},\ \frac{r}{2} \leq x_2 \leq r\} \\ &= \left[(0, -r,\ -\frac{3r}{4}),\, (0, -\frac{r}{2},\, -\frac{3r}{4})\right] \cup \left[(0,\, \frac{r}{2},\, -\frac{3r}{4}),\, (0, r,\, -\frac{3r}{4})\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

This intersection is hence the union of two segments parallel to the vector $\vec{e}_2$. We notice also that the union $\mathrm{D}^-_{\perp,r} \cup \mathcal{C}^+_{\perp,r}$ yields a closed curve which bounds in the plane $P_{2,3}$ of $\mathbb{R}^3$ a region containing the point $O_1 = (0,0,1/4)$, the curve $\mathcal{C}^+_{\perp,r}$ bounding it from above, whereas the segment $\mathrm{D}^-_{\perp,r}$ is bounding it from below. On the other hand, the segment $\mathrm{D}_{0,r}$ is perpendular to the plane $P_{2,3}$ and passes exactly through the point O_1, hence the region bounded by $\mathrm{D}^-_{\perp,r} \cup \mathcal{C}^+_{\perp,r}$.

$\mathbb{S}^2$-valued maps on Q^3_r using a variant of the Pontryagin construction. Given $0 \leq \varrho \leq 10^{-2}r$, we relate to the previously constructed curves $\mathbb{S}^2$-valued maps through the Pontryagin construction or variants of it. In order to have orientations consistent with the constructions in subsection 4.2, we choose on $\mathrm{D}_{0,r}$ the framing $\mathfrak{e}^\perp_0 = (\vec{e}_3, -\vec{e}_2)$, whereas on $\mathrm{D}^-_{\perp,r}$ we set $\mathfrak{e}^\perp_0 = (\vec{e}_1, -\vec{e}_3)$. We first consider the map $\gamma^+_{\varrho,r}$ defined on Q^3_r by

$$\gamma^+_{\varrho,r} = \Psi_\varrho[(\mathrm{D}_{0,r}, \mathfrak{e}^\perp_0) \cup (\mathrm{D}^-_{\perp,r}, \mathfrak{e}^\perp_0)] = \Psi_\varrho[(\mathrm{D}_{0,r}, \mathfrak{e}^\perp_0)] \vee_3 \Psi_\varrho[\mathrm{D}^-_{\perp,r}, \mathfrak{e}^\perp_0)], \tag{4.16}$$

and then similarily, we define on on Q^3_r a map $\gamma^-_{\varrho,r}$ as

$$\gamma^-_{\varrho,r} = \Psi_\varrho[(\mathrm{D}_{0,r}, \mathfrak{e}^\perp_0)] \vee_3 \tilde{\Psi}_\varrho[\mathcal{C}^+_{\perp,r}]. \tag{4.17}$$

The notation $\tilde{\Psi}_\varrho[\mathcal{C}^+_{\perp,r}]$ which appears in the previous definition corresponds actually to a *variant of the Pontragyin construction*, for which the plane orthogonal to the curve is replaced[6] by a plane parallel[7] to the plane $x_2 = 0$. More precisely, it is defined on Q^3_r by

$$\tilde{\Psi}_\varrho[\mathcal{C}^+_{\perp,r}](x_1, x_2, x_3) = \chi_\varrho\left(x_1, -\left[x_3 - \mathfrak{g}(\frac{x_2}{r})\right]\right),$$

[5] which will be determined in the course of subsection 4.2.

[6] these two planes coincide if $\mathfrak{g}'(x_2) = 0$.

[7] the corresponding framing would correspond then to the framing on $\mathrm{D}^-_{\perp,r}$ that is $(\vec{e}_1, -\vec{e}_3)$

where χ_ϱ is defined in (24) and (25). An important consequence of the definitions (4.16) and (4.17) as well as of (4.15) is that

$$\gamma^+_{\varrho,r}(x) = \gamma^-_{\varrho,r}(x) \text{ for } x \in \partial \mathrm{Q}^3_r, \tag{4.18}$$

in particular, we have

$$\begin{cases} \gamma^+_{\varrho,r}(x) = \gamma^-_{\varrho,r}(x) = \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}} \text{ on } [-r,r]^2 \times \{-r,r\} \\ \gamma^+_{\varrho,r}(x) = \gamma^-_{\varrho,r}(x) = \chi_\varrho(x_3 - \frac{r}{4}, -x_2) \text{ on } \{-r,r\} \times [-r,r]^2 \\ \gamma^+_{\varrho,r}(x) = \gamma^-_{\varrho,r}(x) = \chi_\varrho(x_1, -x_3 - \frac{3r}{4}) \text{ on } [-r,r] \times \{-r,r\} \times [-r,r]. \end{cases} \tag{4.19}$$

$\mathbb{S}^2$-valued maps on $\partial \mathrm{Q}^4_r$. We take advantage of (4.18) and (4.19) to define on $\partial \mathrm{Q}^4_r$ an $\mathbb{S}^2$ valued map $\gamma_{\varrho,r}$ having the values of $\gamma^+_{\varrho,r}$ on the upper part of the boundary and $\gamma^-_{\varrho,r}$ on the lower. More precisely, we define $\gamma_{\varrho,r}$ on $\partial \mathrm{Q}^4_r$ as

$$\begin{cases} \gamma_{\varrho,r}(x_1,x_2,x_3,r) = \gamma^+_{\varrho,r}(x_1,x_2,x_3) \text{ on } [-r,r]^3 \times \{r\} \subset \mathfrak{Q}^{3,+}_4(r,0) \\ \gamma_{\varrho,r}(x_1,x_2,x_3,-r) = \gamma^-_{\varrho,r}(x_1,x_2,x_3) \text{ on } [-r,r]^3 \times \{-r\} \subset \mathfrak{Q}^{3,-}_4(r,0) \\ \gamma_{\varrho,r}(x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4) = \gamma^-_{\varrho,r}(x_1,x_2,x_3) = \gamma^+_{\varrho,r}(x_1,x_2,x_3) \text{ on } \partial \mathrm{Q}^3_r \times [-r,r] \end{cases}$$

so that $\gamma_{\varrho,r}$ is a Lipschitz $\mathbb{S}^2$ valued map on $\partial \mathrm{Q}^4_r$ which has the topology of a 3-sphere $\mathbb{S}^3$.

The map $\gamma_{\varrho,r}$ correspond almost[8] to the Pontryagin construction related to the curve $\mathcal{L}$ in ∂Q^4_r we define next. We set $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_1 \cup \mathcal{L}_2$ where

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_1 = \mathrm{D}_{0,r} \times \{r,-r\} \cup \{(r,0,\frac{r}{4})\} \times [-r,r] \cup \{(-r,0,\frac{r}{4})\} \times [-r,r] \text{ and} \\ \mathcal{L}_2 = \mathcal{C}^+_{\perp,r} \times \{r\} \cup \mathrm{D}^-_{\perp,r} \times \{-r\} \cup \{(0,r,-\frac{3r}{4})\} \times [-r,r] \cup \{(0,-r,-\frac{3r}{4})\} \times [-r,r]. \end{cases}$$

The curve $\mathcal{L}_1$ is hence actually the boundary of the square $[-r,r] \times \{0\} \times \{\frac{r}{4}\} \times [-r,r]$ and hence included in the two dimensional plane $\mathcal{P}_{1,4} + \frac{r}{4}\vec{e}_3$ of $\mathbb{R}^4$ given by the equations $x_2 = 0$ and $x_3 = \dfrac{r}{4}$. It has an upper segment included in $\mathfrak{Q}^{3,+}_4(r,0)$, a lower segment included in $\mathfrak{Q}^{3,-}_4(r,0)$ and two latteral segments included in $\mathfrak{Q}^{3,\pm}_1(r,0)$. On the other hand, the curve $\mathcal{L}_2$ is included in the three dimensional hyperplane plane of $\mathbb{R}^4$ given by the equation $x_1 = 0$, with an upper part in $\mathfrak{Q}^{3,+}_4(r,0)$, a straight lower part in $\mathfrak{Q}^{3,+}_4(r,0)$ and two latteral segments included in $\mathfrak{Q}^{3,\pm}_2(r,0)$. The two curves inherit a natural orientation induces by our choice of framings on the orthogonal planes. We claim that

$$\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2) = 1. \tag{4.20}$$

This identity may again be deduced using the crossing number of the two lines. Details are left to the reader.

Lemma 4.2. *We have* $\mathrm{H}(\gamma_{\varrho,r}) = 2$.

[8] in the sense that Ψ is replace by $\tilde{\Psi}$ in some places

Proof. The proof follows immediately from Lemma 2.2 and identity (4.20). □

Concerning the E_3 energy of $\gamma_{\varrho,r}$ we easily verify that

$$\mathrm{E}_3(\gamma_{\varrho,r}) \leq C\varrho^{-1}r. \tag{4.21}$$

Finally, we consider the extension $\boxdot_{\varrho,r}$ of $\gamma_{\varrho,r}$ to the cube Q_r given by

$$\boxdot_{\varrho,r}(x) = \mathfrak{Ext}_{r,0}(\gamma_{\varrho,r})(x) \text{ for } x \in \mathrm{Q}_r. \tag{4.22}$$

Notice that $\boxdot_{\varrho,r}$ is Lipschitz on the cube Q_r except at the origin, where, in view of Lemma 4.2 it possesses a point singularity of Hopf invariant equal to 1. Invoking (4.11) and (4.21) we estimate its energy as

$$\mathrm{E}_3(\boxdot_{\varrho,r}) \leq C\varrho^{-1}r^2. \tag{4.23}$$

4.1.5 Removing topologicaly trivial singularities

This type of construction can be found for instance in [11, 6]. Consider more generally a map from a smooth bounded domain Ω_4 of $\mathbb{R}^4$ and a map $w : \Omega_4 \to \mathcal{N}$ where $\mathcal{N}$ is a arbitrary compact manifold, such that $w \in \mathcal{R}(\Omega_4, \mathcal{N}) \cap W^{1,3}(\Omega_4, \mathcal{N})$. In particular, w has a finite number of points singularities $\{a_1, \ldots, a_m\}$. As already seen, to each singularity a_i of w the homotopy class of the restriction of v to any small sphere centered at a_i does not depend on the radius, provided it is sufficiently small and defines an element $[\![a_i]\!]$ in $\pi_3(\mathcal{N})$. Our next result states that, in the case the singularity a_i is trivial, that is $[\![a_i]\!] = 0$, then the singularity can be removed through approximation.

Lemma 4.3 ([11, 6])**.** *Assume that $[\![a_1]\!] = 0$. Then there exist a sequence of maps $(w_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $w_n \in C^\infty(\Omega_4, \mathcal{N}) \cap W^{1,3}(\Omega_4, \mathcal{N})$, $w_n = w$ on $\partial\Omega$ and*

$$w_n \to w \text{ in } W^{1,3}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^\ell) \text{ as } n \to +\infty.$$

4.2 Proof of Proposition 4

As mentioned, the construction of $\mathfrak{C}_k$ consist in pushing down along the x_3-axis the set $\mathfrak{L}_k^\perp$ while keeping the set $\mathfrak{L}_k$ fixed an considering, up to some small variants which have already been pointed out, the corresponding Pontryagin construction. The time variable in such a procedure will then correspond to the space variable x_4. The main tool for pushing down the curves will be the mapping $\mathcal{P}_\zeta$, used with appropriate functions ζ. Since the two sets of fibers are linked and since one of them is pushed downwards, collisions between the fibers of $\mathfrak{L}_k$ and the pushed down fibers of $\mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}$ have to occur. Within our construction, the two sets will meet in their straight parts, more precisely in the cube of $\mathbb{R}^3$ given by

$$\mathcal{Q}_0 = [0,1] \times [0,-1] \times [0,1] = A_0 + [0,1]^3 \text{ where } A_0 = (0,-1,0).$$

Since we work in a Sobolev class, fibers will be allowed to cross thanks to the extension procedure related to the mapping $\boxdot_{\varrho,r}$ with the choice $\varrho = r_0(k)$. Such a crossing is of course forbidden in the continuous class, each crossing creating a change of homotopy class of the

corresponding map. In the 4-dimensional space, this crossing creates a singularity of non-trivial charge, which will be denoted $\mathfrak{a}^k_{i,j,q,r}$. As a matter of fact, the projection onto $\mathbb{R}^3$ of the singularities will be close to the k^3 crossing points $\alpha^k_{i,j,q}$

$$\alpha^k_{i,j,q} = (\frac{i}{k}, -\frac{j}{k}, \frac{q}{k}) = (i\,h, -j\,h, q\,h) \in \mathcal{Q}_0 \text{ for } i,j,q = 1,\dots,k \text{ with } h = \frac{1}{k}. \tag{4.24}$$

Due to some unessential technical reason, the actual singularities will be translated by $-(h/8)\vec{e}_3$ and will project onto the points

$$\tilde{\alpha}^k_{i,j,q} = \alpha^k_{i,j,q} - \frac{h}{8}\vec{e}_3 = (i\,h, -j\,h, (q - \frac{1}{8})\,h) \in \mathcal{Q}_0 \text{ for } i,j,q = 1,\dots,k. \tag{4.25}$$

The construction will be performed using several quite distinct steps, where we either use push-down fields or extensions creating singularity, as described in the previous subsection. Each step corresponds to a specific time interval $[\mathcal{T}^k_n, \mathcal{T}^k_{n+1}]$, with $\mathcal{T}^k_0 = 0$,

$$\mathcal{T}^k_1 = 2 - \frac{h}{2} \text{ and } \mathcal{T}^k_{n+1} = \mathcal{T}^k_n + h = 2 + nh - \frac{h}{2} \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}^* \text{ with } h = \frac{1}{k},$$

the corresponding strips in the $\mathbb{R}^4$ space being given by

$$\mathfrak{B}^k_n = \mathbb{R}^3 \times [\mathcal{T}^k_n, \mathcal{T}^k_{n+1}].$$

Finally our singularities will have the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{a}^k_{i,j,q,r} &= (i\,h, -j\,h, (q - \frac{1}{8})\,h, \mathcal{T}^k_{2r} + \frac{h}{2}) = (ih, -i\,h, (q - \frac{1}{8})h, 2 + 2h\,r) \\ &= (\tilde{\alpha}^k_{i,j,q},\ 2 + 2h\,r). \end{aligned} \tag{4.26}$$

Throughout the proof $C \geq 0$ will denote some constant which is independent of k.

Step 1: pushing $\mathfrak{L}^\perp_k$ downwards towards $\mathfrak{L}_k$. We consider here for as push function ζ the constant function ζ_0

$$\zeta_0(x_1, x_2, x_3) = 1, \ \ \forall (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

For $0 \leq x_4 \leq \mathcal{T}^k_1$ we consider the sets

$$\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp}(x_4) \equiv P_{\zeta_0}(\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp}, x_4) = \mathcal{L}^{k,\perp} - x_4\vec{e}_3 \text{ as well as } \mathcal{L}^{k,\perp}_{i,j}(x_4) \equiv \mathcal{L}^{k,\perp}_{i,j} - x_4\vec{e}_3. \tag{4.27}$$

We define the map $\mathfrak{C}_k$ on the strip $\mathfrak{B}^k_0 \equiv \mathbb{R}^3 \times [0, T^k_1]$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{C}_k(x, x_4) &= \left[P_{\zeta_0}(\Psi_\varrho(\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp}(x_4)) \vee_3 \Psi_\varrho(\mathcal{L}^k)\right](x) \\ &= \Psi_\varrho\left((\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp} - x_4\vec{e}_3) \cup \mathcal{L}^k\right)(x), \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^3. \end{aligned} \tag{4.28}$$

Notice that $\mathfrak{C}_k$ defined as above is smooth on the strip $\mathfrak{B}^k_0$, that

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(\cdot, 0) = \mathfrak{S}_k(\cdot) \text{ and that} \tag{4.29}$$

$$\text{dist}\,((\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp} - x_4\vec{e}_3, \mathcal{L}^k) = 2 - x_4 \text{ in particular dist}\,((\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp} - \mathcal{T}_1^k\vec{e}_3, \mathcal{L}^k) = \frac{h}{2}. \tag{4.30}$$

Turning to energy estimates, it follows from the fact that $|\nabla\zeta_0| = 0$ and Lemma 4.1 that

$$|\nabla_4 P_{\zeta_0}(\Psi_\varrho(\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp}(x_4)(x)| \leq Ck,$$

so that by integration on the set where the gradient does not vanish, we are led to

$$\int_{\mathfrak{B}_0^k} |\nabla_4 \mathfrak{C}_k|^3 \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla \mathfrak{S}_k|^3. \tag{4.31}$$

In view of (4.30) we observe that the lowest fibers of $\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}_0^k)$, i.e. the curves $\mathcal{L}_{i,1}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}_0^k)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$ have now been brought close to the upper fibers of $\mathcal{L}^k$, i.e. the curves $\mathcal{L}_{i',k}^k$ for $i' = 1, \ldots, k$. Our next aim will be to continue to lower with the same speed the fibers of $\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp}$ while keeping $\mathfrak{L}^k$ fixed, without meeting the curves $\mathcal{L}_{i',k}^k$, hence avoiding the singularities $\alpha_{i,j,k}$.

Step 2: Avoiding the first crossings. We replace for the purpose described above the constant function ζ_0 by the function $\zeta = \zeta_1$ of the form

$$\zeta_1(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \zeta_1(x_2, x_3) = 1 - \left[\sum_{j=1}^k g_2\left(k\left(x_2 + j\,h\right)\right)\right] g_3(x_2, x_3), \tag{4.32}$$

where g_2 denotes a smooth non-negative function on $\mathbb{R}$ such that

$$g_2(t) = 0 \text{ for } t \in \mathbb{R}\setminus[-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}],\ g_2(t) = \frac{3}{4} \text{ for } t \in [-\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}],\ \text{and } 0 \leq g_2(t) \leq \frac{3}{4} \text{ otherwise,} \tag{4.33}$$

and where the function g_3 denotes a smooth non-negative function on $\mathbb{R}^2$ such that $0 \leq g_3 \leq 1$ and

$$\begin{cases} g_3(x_2, x_3) = 0 \text{ for } (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus [-2, 1] \times [2, -1] \\ g_3(x_2, x_3) = 1 \text{ for } (x_1, x_2) \in [-1, 0] \times [0, 1]. \end{cases} \tag{4.34}$$

It follows in particular from this definition that for $j = 0, \ldots, k$ we have

$$\begin{cases} \zeta_1(x_1, \frac{j}{k}, x_3) = \frac{1}{4} \text{ for any } j = 1, \ldots, k, \text{ for } x_1 \in [-1, 1] \text{ and for } x_3 \geq 0 \\ \zeta_1(x_1, x_2, x_3) = 1 \text{ for } x_1 \in \mathbb{R},\ x_3 \geq 0 \text{ and } x_2 \notin \overset{k}{\underset{j=1}{\cup}}[h(j - \frac{1}{4}), h(j + \frac{1}{4})]. \end{cases} \tag{4.35}$$

The definition (4.32) yields the estimate

$$\|\zeta_1\|_\infty \leq C \text{ and } \|\nabla\zeta_1\|_\infty \leq Ck.$$

It hence follows from Lemma 4.1 that for any $s \in [0, h]$ and any $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$

$$\begin{cases} |\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\mathcal{P}_{\zeta_1}(v)(s)(x)| + |\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^3}\mathcal{P}_{\zeta_1}(v)(s)(x)| \leq C\|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \exp\left(C\|\nabla\zeta_1\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)}h\right) \\ \qquad\qquad \leq C\|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)}. \end{cases} \tag{4.36}$$

Defining $\mathfrak{C}_k$ on the strip $\mathfrak{B}_1^k$. We introduce the subset Γ_1^k of $\mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}_1^k)$ defined by

$$\Gamma_1^k = \underset{i=1}{\overset{k}{\cup}} \mathfrak{L}_{i,1}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}_1^k). \tag{4.37}$$

This set corresponds to the union of fibers of $\mathfrak{L}_k^\perp$ which are the closest to $\mathfrak{L}^k$. We move these fibers Γ_1^k according to the flow given by ζ_1 on the time interval $[\mathcal{T}_1^k, \mathcal{T}_2^k]$, where $\mathcal{T}_2^k = \mathcal{T}_1^k + h$. The other fibers, that is the fibers in $\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}_1^k) \setminus \Gamma_1^k$ are moved according to the constant field $\zeta_0 = 1$, and hence will be translated down the $\vec{e}_3$ direction by a lenght equal to h, while the set $\mathfrak{L}^k$ remains fixed. We define hence the map $\mathfrak{C}_k$ on the strip $\mathfrak{B}_1^k \equiv \mathbb{R}^3 \times [\mathcal{T}_1^k, \mathcal{T}_2^k]$ as

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(x, \mathcal{T}_1^k + s) = P_{\zeta_0}\left(\Psi_\varrho(\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}_1^k) \setminus \Gamma_1^k)\right)(s) \vee_3 P_{\zeta_1}(\Psi_\varrho(\Gamma_1^k))(s) \vee_3 \Psi_\varrho(\mathfrak{L}^k). \tag{4.38}$$

The shape of the fibers of $\mathfrak{C}_k(\cdot, \mathcal{T}_2^k)$. Let us first describe how an arbitrary fiber $\mathfrak{L}_{i,1}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}_1^k)$ in Γ_1^k is transported by the flow Φ_1 related to ζ_1. In view of (4.27) the fibers of $\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}_1^k)$ are just translates of the fibers at time 0, and hence the fibers in $\mathfrak{L}_{i,1}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}_1^k)$ are straight segments for $-7 \leq x_2 \leq 3$. As a matter of fact, we have

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{i,1}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}_1^k) \equiv \mathfrak{L}_{i,1}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}_1^k) \cap \left(\mathbb{R} \times [-3,7] \times \mathbb{R}^+\right) = \{i\,h\} \times [-3,7] \times \{1 + \frac{h}{2}\}.$$

We set for $s \in [0,h]$ and $i = 1, \ldots, k$

$$\mathfrak{L}_{i,1}^{k,\perp}(s + \mathcal{T}_1^k) = P_{\zeta_1}(\mathfrak{L}_{i,1}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}_1^k))(s). \tag{4.39}$$

Combining (4.4) with the choosen form (4.32) of ζ_1, we check that the set $\tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{i,1}^{k,\perp}(s + \mathcal{T}_1^k) \equiv \mathfrak{L}_{i,1}^{k,\perp}(s + \mathcal{T}_1^k) \cap (\mathbb{R} \times [-3,7] \times \mathbb{R}^+)$ has the form

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{i,1}^{k,\perp}(s + \mathcal{T}_1^k) = \{ih\} \times \{(x_2, x_3),\ -3 \leq x_2 \leq 7, x_3 = 1 + \dfrac{h}{2} - f^k(x_2, s)\} \\ \text{with } f^k(x_2, s) = s\left(1 - \displaystyle\sum_{j=1}^{k} g_2((x_2 + jh))\right) \text{ for } x_2 \in [-3,7] \text{ and } s \in [0,h]. \end{cases}$$

For $s = h$ we notice that, setting $x_2^{j,k} = -jh$

$$\begin{cases} f^k(x_2, h) = h \text{ if } x_2 \notin \cup[x_2^{j,k} - \dfrac{h}{4}, x_2^{j,k} + \dfrac{h}{4}], \text{ for } j = 1, \ldots, k \text{ whereas} \\ f^k(x_2, h) = \dfrac{h}{4} \text{ for } x_2 \in \cup[x_2^{j,k} - \dfrac{h}{8}, x_2^{j,k} + \dfrac{h}{8}], \end{cases}$$

so that

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{i,1}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}_2^k) \cap \{(x_1, x_2, x_3), x_2 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \underset{j=1}{\overset{k}{\cup}}[x_2^{j,k} - \dfrac{h}{4}, x_2^{j,k} + \dfrac{h}{4}]\} \subset \{i\,h\} \times [-3,7] \times \{1 - \dfrac{h}{2}\} \\ \qquad \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{i,1}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}_2^k) \cap \{(x_1, x_2, x_3), x_2 \in \underset{j=1}{\overset{k}{\cup}}[x_2^{j,k} - \dfrac{h}{8}, x_2^{j,k} + \dfrac{h}{8}]\} \subset \{i\,h\} \times [-3,7] \times \{1 + \dfrac{h}{4}\}. \end{cases}$$

In conclusion, we observe that most of the set $\mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}_2^k)$ corresponds to a translation by the $-h\vec{e}_3$ of the set $\mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}_1^k)$ except the parts of the fibers Γ_1^k which are near the points

$(ih, -jh, 1+\frac{h}{2})$ which are only translated by $-\frac{1}{4}h\vec{e}_3$ and hence remains above the first highest singularities $\alpha^k_{i,j,k}$. Similar to (4.39) we set, for $2 \le q \le k$

$$\mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}_{i,q}(s + \mathcal{T}^k_1) = P_{\zeta_0}(\mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}_{i,q}(\mathcal{T}^k_1))(s) \text{ for } s \in [0, h],$$

so that at time $\mathcal{T}^k_2$ these fibers have been translated by the vector $-h\vec{e}_3$. Notice in particular the fibers $\mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}_{i,2}(\mathcal{T}^k_2)$ are above the highest singularities $\alpha^k_{i,j,k}$ by a distance $\frac{h}{2}$ or more precisely

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{L}}^{k,\perp}_{i,q}(\mathcal{T}^k_2) \equiv \mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}_{i,q}(\mathcal{T}^k_2) \cap \big(\mathbb{R} \times [-3, 7] \times \mathbb{R}^+\big) = \{i\, h\} \times [-3, 7] \times \{1 + (q-1)\frac{h}{2}\}.$$

for $2 \le q \le k$. We leave it to the reader to check that the three maps appearing in the definition (4.38) have, for any $s \in [0, h]$ disjoint supports, so that (4.38) is well-defined.

The energy on the strip $\mathfrak{B}^k_1$. In follows from the definition (4.38) of $\mathfrak{C}_k$ on the strip $\mathfrak{B}^k_1 \equiv \mathbb{R}^3 \times [\mathcal{T}^k_1, \mathcal{T}^k_2]$ and estimate (4.36) that

$$|\nabla \mathfrak{C}_k| \le Ck,$$

so that by integration we obtain

$$\int_{\mathfrak{B}^k_1} |\nabla_4 \mathfrak{C}_k|^3 \le Ch \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla \mathfrak{S}_k|^3 \le Ck^2. \tag{4.40}$$

The value of $\mathfrak{C}_k$ *for* $x_4 = \mathcal{T}^k_2$. We consider the translate $\tilde{\alpha}^k_{i,j,k}$ of $\alpha^k_{i,j,k}$ defined in (4.25) and defined by $\tilde{\alpha}^k_{i,j,k} = \alpha^k_{i,j,k} - \frac{h}{8}\vec{e}_3$ and the three dimensional cubes

$$\mathrm{Q}^3_{\frac{h}{2}}(\tilde{\alpha}^k_{i,j,k}) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3, \text{ s.t } |x - \tilde{\alpha}^k_{i,j,k}|_\infty \le \frac{h}{2}\}, \text{ and the set } \mathcal{V}^k_2 = \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \bigcup_{i,j=1}^{k} \mathrm{Q}^3_{\frac{h}{2}}(\tilde{\alpha}_{i,j,k}).$$

The reader may check that in view of (4.38) we have, for $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathcal{V}^k_2$

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(x_1, x_2, x_3, \mathcal{T}^k_2) = \Psi_\varrho\left(\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp} - (2 + \frac{h}{2})\vec{e}_3\right) \vee_3 \Psi_\varrho\left(\mathcal{L}^k\right)(x_1, x_2, x_3). \tag{4.41}$$

Concerning the value on the cube $\mathrm{Q}^3_{\frac{h}{2}}(\tilde{\alpha}_{i,j,k})$ we observe that it matches the definition of the map $\gamma^-_{\varrho,r}$ given in (4.17), with $r = \frac{h}{2}$ and translating the origin at the point $\tilde{\alpha}_{i,j,k}$. The function $\mathfrak{g}$ which enters in the definition of (4.17) through (4.13) has to be choosen as

$$\mathfrak{g} = 1 - g_2.$$

This choice satisfying assumptions (4.14). We have in particular

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(x_1, x_2, x_3, \mathcal{T}^k_2) = \gamma^-_{\varrho,\frac{h}{2}}(x - \tilde{\alpha}_{i,j,k}) \text{ for } (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathrm{Q}^3_{\frac{h}{2}}(\tilde{\alpha}_{i,j,k}). \tag{4.42}$$

Step 3: Allowing crossings through singularities. The aim of this step is to let the fibers in Γ^k_1 cross the upper fibers of the set $\mathfrak{L}^k$ which is not moved. This procedure is carried out on the strip $\mathfrak{B}^k_2 \equiv \mathbb{R}^3 \times [\mathcal{T}^k_2, \mathcal{T}^k_3]$. In order to construct $\mathfrak{C}_k$ on that strip, we introduce for

general indices $i,j,q,r = 1,\dots,k$ the 4-dimensional cubes centered at the singularities $\mathfrak{a}^k_{i,j,q,r}$ defined in (4.26) and of edge $\frac{h}{2}$ namely the disjoint cubes

$$\mathrm{Q}^k_{i,j,q,r} = \mathrm{Q}^4_{\frac{h}{2}}(\mathfrak{a}^k_{i,j,q,r}) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^4, \text{ such that } |x - \mathfrak{a}^k_{i,j,q,r}|_\infty < \frac{h}{2}\}.$$

We focus here on the layer of the k^2 cubes given by $\mathrm{Q}^k_{i,j,k,1}$, i.e, such that $q = k$ and $r = 1$, corresponding hence to the upper layer of the crossing points $\tilde{\alpha}^k_{i,j,q}$ and $r = 1$, yielding the first occurence of singularities. We set

$$\mathcal{A}^k_2 = \bigcup_{i,j=1}^k \mathrm{Q}^k_{i,j,k,1} = \bigcup_{i,j=1}^k \mathrm{Q}^4_{\frac{h}{2}}(\mathfrak{a}_{i,j,k,1}) \text{ and } \mathcal{O}^k_2 = \mathfrak{B}^k_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}^k_2.$$

We notice that

$$\bar{\mathcal{A}}^k_2 = [0,1] \times [-1,0] \times [1 - \frac{5h}{8}, 1 + \frac{3h}{8}] \times [\mathcal{T}^k_2, \mathcal{T}^k_3].$$

On the complement $\mathcal{O}^k_2$ we keep value of the function $\mathfrak{C}_k$ at time $\mathcal{T}^k_2$, that is we define it as

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4) = \mathfrak{C}_k(x_1,x_2,x_3,\mathcal{T}^k_2), \text{ for } (x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4) \in \mathcal{O}^k_2. \tag{4.43}$$

It follows that, in view of (4.41), the function $\mathfrak{C}_k$ as a simple form on the subset $\mathcal{O}^k_{2,\mathrm{cros}}$ of $\mathcal{O}^k_2$ defined by

$$\mathcal{O}^k_{2,\mathrm{cros}} = [0,1] \times [-1,0] \times [\mathcal{T}^k_2, \mathcal{T}^k_3] \setminus \mathcal{A}^k_2 = \cup \partial \mathrm{Q}^3_{\frac{h}{2}}(\alpha^k_{i,j,k}) \times (\mathcal{T}^k_1, \mathcal{T}^k_2)$$

given by

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4) = \Psi_\varrho \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^k \mathcal{L}^{k,\perp}_{i,1} - (2 + \frac{h}{2})\vec{e}_3 \right)(x_1,x_2,x_3). \tag{4.44}$$

It remains to determine the value of $\mathfrak{C}_k$ *inside each cube* $\mathrm{Q}^k_{i,j,k,1}$ for $i,j = 1,\dots,k$. For that purpose, we proceed using a cubic extension and therefore we prescribe first its value on each of the 8 faces $\mathfrak{Q}^{3,\pm}_p(\frac{h}{2}, \mathfrak{a}^k_{i,j,k,1})$ of the boundary $\partial \mathrm{Q}^k_{i,j,q,r}$. As a matter of fact, the values on the faces $p = 1,2,3$ is already prescribed in view of (4.44) namely, setting $\tilde{x}^{i,j} = x - \tilde{\alpha}_{i,j,k,1}$, for $i,j = 1,\dots,k$

$$\begin{cases} \mathfrak{C}_k(x) = \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}} \text{ for } x \in \bigcup_{i,j=1}^k \mathfrak{Q}^{3,\pm}_3(\frac{h}{2}, \mathfrak{a}^k_{i,j,k,1}) \\ \mathfrak{C}_k(x) = \chi_\varrho(\tilde{x}^{i,j}_3 - \frac{h}{8}, -\tilde{x}^{i,j}_2), \text{ for } x \in \mathfrak{Q}^{3,\pm}_1(\frac{h}{2}, \mathfrak{a}^k_{i,j,k,1}) \\ \mathfrak{C}_k(x) = \chi_\varrho(\tilde{x}^{i,j}_1, \tilde{x}^{i,j}_3 - \frac{3}{4}h) \text{ for } x \in \mathfrak{Q}^{3,\pm}_2(\frac{h}{2}, \mathfrak{a}^k_{i,j,k,1}). \end{cases}$$

Concerning the value on the face $\mathfrak{Q}^{3,-}_4(\frac{h}{2}, \mathfrak{a}^k_{i,j,k,1})$ it has to match the correspond value given in Step 2 at the time $\mathcal{T}^k_2$ and discussed at the end of the previous steps. We have hence no freedom there since it is and given by (4.42). It therefore only remains to prescribe the value of $\mathfrak{C}_k$ on the remaining face $\mathfrak{Q}^{3,+}_4(\frac{h}{2}, \mathfrak{a}^k_{i,j,k,1})$, which is indeed the only degree of freedom left. We set

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(x_1,x_2,x_3,\mathcal{T}^k_3) = \gamma^+_{\varrho,\frac{h}{2}}(x - \alpha_{i,j,k}) \text{ for } x = (x_1,x_2,x_3) \in \mathrm{Q}^3_{\frac{h}{2}}(\alpha_{i,j,k}). \tag{4.45}$$

It follows that on the boundary $\partial \mathrm{Q}^k_{i,j,k,1}$ we have

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(x) = \gamma_{\varrho,\frac{h}{2}}(x - \mathfrak{a}^k_{i,j,k,1}) \text{ for } x \in \partial \mathrm{Q}^k_{i,j,k,1}, \tag{4.46}$$

and we may therefore define the value of $\mathfrak{C}_k$ inside the cube as the cubic extension, that is using the notation introduce in (4.22)

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(x) = \boxdot_{\varrho,\frac{h}{2}}(x - \mathfrak{a}^k_{i,j,k,1}) = \mathfrak{E}\mathrm{xt}_{r,0}(\gamma_{\varrho,\frac{h}{2}}(\cdot - \mathfrak{a}^k_{i,j,k,1}))(x) \text{ for } x \in \mathrm{Q}^k_{i,j,k,1}. \tag{4.47}$$

We notice that, in view of the definition (4.47), the map $\mathfrak{C}_k$ is Lipshitz on $\mathfrak{B}^k_2$ except on the discrete set

$$\Upsilon^k_1 = \bigcup_{i,j=1}^{k} \{\mathfrak{a}_{i,j,k,1}\} \subset \mathfrak{B}^k_2,$$

each of the k^2 points in Υ^k_1 being a singularity of $\mathfrak{C}_k$ of Hopf invariant equal to $+2$ in view of Lemma 4.2.

The energy on the strip $\mathfrak{B}^k_2$. Combining (4.42) with (4.41) we deduce that

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}^k_2} |\nabla \mathfrak{C}_k|^3 = \int_{\mathcal{T}^k_2}^{\mathcal{T}^k_3} \int_{\mathcal{V}^k_2} |\nabla \mathfrak{C}_k(\cdot, \mathcal{T}^k_2)|^3 \leq Ch(k^3 |\mathfrak{L}^k \cup \mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}|) \leq Ck^2,$$

whereas we deduce from (4.23) that $\int_{\mathrm{Q}^k_{i,j,k,1}} |\nabla \mathfrak{C}_k|^3 \leq Ck^{-1}$ so that $\int_{\mathcal{A}^k_2} |\nabla \mathfrak{C}_k|^3 \leq Ck$, and hence we are led to the estimate

$$\int_{\mathfrak{B}^k_2} |\nabla \mathfrak{C}_k|^3 \leq Ck^2. \tag{4.48}$$

The value of $\mathfrak{C}_k$ *at time* $\mathcal{T}^k_3$. Combining (4.43), (4.41) with (4.42), we deduce that for any $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, we have the identity

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{C}_k(x_1, x_2, x_3, \mathcal{T}^k_3) &= \Psi_\varrho \left(\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp} - (2 + \frac{h}{2})\vec{e}_3 \right) \vee_3 \Psi_\varrho \left(\mathcal{L}^k \right) (x_1, x_2, x_3) \\ &= \Psi_\varrho \left(\left(\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp} - (2 + \frac{h}{2})\vec{e}_3 \right) \cup \mathcal{L}^k \right) (x_1, x_2, x_3). \end{aligned} \tag{4.49}$$

It corresponds hence to a shift downards of the sheaf $\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp}$, the absolute value of the total linking number being decreased by k^2.

Step 4. Step 4 is similar to step 2, that is we lower the fibers of $\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}^k_3) \equiv \mathcal{L}^{k,\perp} - (2 + \frac{h}{2})\vec{e}_3$ by a lenght equal to h circumventing the singularities $\alpha^k_{i,j,q}$which are on the way. These singularities are actually the $2k^2$ elements of set of points

$$\mathrm{S}^k_{\mathrm{ing},4} \equiv \bigcup_{i,j=1}^{k} (\alpha_{i,j,k} \cup \alpha_{i,j,k-1}).$$

The main difference with Step 2 is that here we have *two layers* of fibers which are concerned by bypassing the singularities. We replace therefore the set Γ^k_1 defined in (4.37) by the set

$$\Gamma^k_2 = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} \left(\mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}_{i,1}(\mathcal{T}^k_3) \cup \mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}_{i,2}(\mathcal{T}^k_3) \right).$$

and define $\mathfrak{C}_k$ on the strip $\mathfrak{B}_3 = \mathbb{R}^3 \times [\mathcal{T}_3^k, \mathcal{T}_4^k]$ similar to (4.38) as, for $s \in [0, h]$

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(x, \mathcal{T}_3^k + s) = P_{\zeta_0}\left(\Psi_\varrho(\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}_3^k) \setminus \Gamma_2^k)\right)(s) \vee_3 P_{\zeta_1}(\Psi_\varrho(\Gamma_2^k))(s) \vee_3 \Psi_\varrho(\mathfrak{L}^k). \tag{4.50}$$

With similar computations as in Step 1, we obtain

$$\int_{\mathfrak{B}_3} |\nabla \mathfrak{C}_k|^3 \leq Ck^2. \tag{4.51}$$

The value of $\mathfrak{C}_k$ *at time* $\mathcal{T}_4^k$. We set $\mathcal{V}_4^k = \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \bigcup_{i,j=1}^k \left(\mathrm{Q}^3_{\frac{h}{2}}(\tilde{\alpha}_{i,j,k-1}) \cup \mathrm{Q}^3_{\frac{h}{2}}(\tilde{\alpha}_{i,j,k})\right)$. We have in view of (4.38) we have, for $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathcal{V}_4^k$

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(x_1, x_2, x_3, \mathcal{T}_4^k) = \Psi_\varrho\left(\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp} - (2 + \frac{3h}{2})\vec{e}_3\right) \vee_3 \Psi_\varrho\left(\mathcal{L}^k\right)(x_1, x_2, x_3), \tag{4.52}$$

whereas we have, for $q = k$ and $q = k - 1$ the identity

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(x_1, x_2, x_3, \mathcal{T}_4^k) = \gamma^-_{\frac{h}{2}}(x - \tilde{\alpha}_{i,j,q}) \text{ for } (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathrm{Q}^3_{\frac{h}{2}}(\alpha_{i,j,q}).$$

Step 5: crossing through singularities. This step is parallel to Step 3. We define

$$\mathcal{A}_5^k = \bigcup_{i,j=1}^k \left(\mathrm{Q}^k_{i,j,k,2} \cup \mathrm{Q}^k_{i,j,k-1,2}\right) = \bigcup_{i,j=1}^k \left(\mathrm{Q}^4_{\frac{h}{2}}(\mathfrak{a}_{i,j,k,2}) \cup \mathrm{Q}^4_{\frac{h}{2}}(\mathfrak{a}_{i,j,k-1,2})\right)$$

and $\mathcal{O}_5^k = \mathfrak{B}_4^k \setminus \mathcal{A}_5^k$, where $\mathfrak{B}_4 = \mathbb{R}^3 \times [\mathcal{T}_4^k, \mathcal{T}_5^k]$. On this set, we define, as in (4.47),

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(x) = \boxdot_{\varrho, \frac{h}{2}}(x - \mathfrak{a}^k_{i,j,q,2}) = \mathfrak{Ext}_{r,0}(\gamma_{\varrho,\frac{h}{2}}(\cdot - \mathfrak{a}^k_{i,j,q,2}))(x) \text{ for } x \in \mathrm{Q}^k_{i,j,q,2}. \tag{4.53}$$

where $q = k - 1, k$ and $i, j = 1, \ldots, k$.
The value of $\mathfrak{C}_k$ *at time* $\mathcal{T}_5^k$. We have

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(x_1, x_2, x_3, \mathcal{T}_5^k) = \Psi_\varrho\left(\left(\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp} - (2 + \frac{3h}{2})\vec{e}_3\right) \cup \mathcal{L}^k\right)(x_1, x_2, x_3). \tag{4.54}$$

the map $\mathfrak{C}_k$ is Lipshitz on the strip $\mathfrak{B}_4^k$ except on the discrete set

$$\Upsilon_2^k = \bigcup_{i,j=1}^k \bigcup_{q=k-1}^k \{\mathfrak{a}_{i,j,q,2}\} \subset \mathfrak{B}_4^k = \mathbb{R}^3 \times [\mathcal{T}_4^k, \mathcal{T}_5^k],$$

each of the $2k^2$ points in Υ_2^k being a singularity of $\mathfrak{C}_k$ of Hopf invariant equal to $+2$.

Using the same construction as in Steps 3 and 5, we proceed *iteratively* up to step $4k + 1$, for which the fibers will be no longer linked. As seen on the previous steps, we have to distinguish *odd* and *even* steps, since in each of the two classes the construction follows the same pattern. Each pair of even and odd steps will be labelled by an integer m running from 0 to $2k$.We describe next more precisely the pattern of these steps.

Step 6 **to Step** $2k+1$**.** Assume that at step $2m+1$, for $m \in \{1,\dots,k\}$, the map $\mathfrak{C}_k$ has been constructed on $[0,\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+1}]$ and satisfies for $x_4 = \mathcal{T}^k_{2m+1}$

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(x_1,x_2,x_3,\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+1}) = \Psi_\varrho\left(\left(\mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp} - (2+\frac{2m-1}{2}\,h)\vec{e}_3\right)\cup\mathcal{L}^k\right)(x_1,x_2,x_3). \tag{4.55}$$

Notice that this condition is already verified for $m=1$ and $m=2$. We set

$$\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+1}) \equiv \mathcal{L}^{k,\perp} - (2+\frac{2m-1}{2}\,h)\vec{e}_3.$$

At step $2m+2$, we construct the map $\mathfrak{C}_k$ the map on the strip $\mathfrak{B}_{2m+1} = \mathbb{R}^3\times[\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+1},\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+2}]$ lowering the fibers of $\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+1})$ by a lenght equal to h circumventing the singularities $\alpha^k_{i,j,q} \in \mathrm{S}^k_{\mathrm{ing,2m+2}}$which are on the way, where

$$\mathrm{S}^k_{\mathrm{ing,2m+2}} \equiv \bigcup_{i,j=1}^{k}\bigcup_{q=k-m}^{k}\alpha_{i,j,q}.$$

Setting $\Gamma^k_m = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k}\bigcup_{q=1}^{m+1}\mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}_{i,q}(\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+1})$ we define $\mathfrak{C}_k$ on the strip $\mathfrak{B}_{2m+1}$ for $s\in[0,h]$

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(x,\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+1}+s) = P_{\zeta_0}\left(\Psi_\varrho(\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+1})\setminus\Gamma^k_m)\right)(s)\ \vee_3\ P_{\zeta_1}(\Psi_\varrho(\Gamma^k_m))(s)\ \vee_3\ \Psi_\varrho(\mathfrak{L}^k). \tag{4.56}$$

Computing as in step 2 and 4, we see that $\mathfrak{C}_k$ is smooth on $\mathfrak{B}^k_{2m+1}$ and that

$$\int_{\mathfrak{B}^k_{2m+1}} |\nabla\mathfrak{C}_k|^3 \le Ck^2. \tag{4.57}$$

The value of $\mathfrak{C}_k$ *at time* $\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+2}$. Setting

$$\mathcal{V}^k_{2m+2} = \mathbb{R}^3\setminus\bigcup_{i,j=1}^{k}\bigcup_{q=k-m}^{k}\left(\mathrm{Q}^3_{\frac{h}{2}}(\alpha_{i,j,q})\cup\mathrm{Q}^3_{\frac{h}{2}}(\alpha_{i,j,q})\right).$$

We have in view of (4.56) we have, for $(x_1,x_2,x_3)\in\mathcal{V}^k_{2m+1}$

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(x_1,x_2,x_3,\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+2}) = \Psi_\varrho\left(\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp} - (2+\frac{(2m+1)h}{2})\vec{e}_3\right)\vee_3\Psi_\varrho\left(\mathcal{L}^k\right)(x_1,x_2,x_3),$$

whereas we have, for $q=k-m,\dots,k$ the identity

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(x_1,x_2,x_3,\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+2}) = \gamma^-_{\frac{h}{2}}(x-\alpha_{i,j,q}) \text{ for } (x_1,x_2,x_3)\in\mathrm{Q}^3_{\frac{h}{2}}(\alpha_{i,j,q}). \tag{4.58}$$

We now define $\mathfrak{C}_k$ on the strip $\mathfrak{B}_{2m+2} = \mathbb{R}^3\times[\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+2},\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+3}]$ as

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(x) = \boxdot_{\varrho,\frac{h}{2}}(x-\mathfrak{a}^k_{i,j,q,m}) = \mathfrak{Ext}_{r,0}(\gamma_{\varrho,\frac{h}{2}}(\cdot-\mathfrak{a}^k_{i,j,q,m}))(x) \text{ for } x\in\mathrm{Q}^k_{i,j,q,m}. \tag{4.59}$$

so that at time $\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+3}$ the map $\mathfrak{C}_k$ is of the form (4.55), with the index m replaced by $m+1$, allowing hence to iterate the contruction. Moreover, arguing as for (4.48), we have the energy estimate

$$\int_{\mathfrak{B}^k_{2m+2}} |\nabla\mathfrak{C}_k|^3 \le Ck^2. \tag{4.60}$$

Note that at the end of step $2m+3$, $m+1$ horizontal layers of k^2 fibers of the set $\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+3})$ have already crossed the fibers of $\mathfrak{L}^k$, that the the map $\mathfrak{C}_k$ is Lipshitz on $\mathbb{R}^3 \times [\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+1}, \mathcal{T}^k_{2m+3}]$ except on the discrete set $\mathcal{Z}^k_m$ given for $m \leq k$

$$\mathcal{Z}^k_{m+1} = \bigcup_{i,j=1}^{k} \bigcup_{q=k-m}^{k} \{\mathfrak{a}_{i,j,q,m+1}\} \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \times [\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+1}, \mathcal{T}^k_{2m+3}], \tag{4.61}$$

each of the $k^2(m+1)$ points in $\mathcal{Z}^k_{m+1}$ being a singularity of $\mathfrak{C}_k$ of Hopf invariant equal to $+2$. At the last step of this paragraph, that is step $2k+1$ of the construction for which $m = k$, we have created $\dfrac{k^3(k+1)}{2}$ singularities of Hopf invariant $+2$. all fibers of $\mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}^k_{2k+1})$ have crossed at least one horizontal layer of fibers of $\mathfrak{L}^k$, whereas the lowers fibers, the fibers $\mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}_{i,1}(\mathcal{T}^k_{2k+1})$ have crossed all fibers of $\mathfrak{L}^k$ and are no longer linked to them.

Step $2k+2$ to Step $4k+1$. The constructions follows exactly the same patterns, the only difference being that at each additional pair of steps fibers are now leaving the crossing region, inducing a few modifications mainly in the description of the labels and the set of indices. The index m runs here from $m = k+1$ to $2k$.

As before, we assume that $\mathfrak{C}_k$ has been constructed on $[0, \mathcal{T}^k_{2m+1}]$, with $m \geq k$ and satisfies at time $\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+1}$ the identity (4.55). Setting $\tilde{\Gamma}^k_m = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} \bigcup_{q=m-k+1}^{k} \mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}_{i,q}(\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+1})$ we define now $\mathfrak{C}_k$ on the strip $\mathfrak{B}_{2m+2}$ for $s \in [0,h]$ by the formula

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(x, \mathcal{T}^k_{2m-1} + s) = P_{\zeta_0}\left(\Psi_\varrho(\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+1}) \setminus \tilde{\Gamma}^k_m)\right)(s) \vee_3 P_{\zeta_1}(\Psi_\varrho(\tilde{\Gamma}^k_m))(s) \vee_3 \Psi_\varrho(\mathfrak{L}^k). \tag{4.62}$$

we consider for $m \geq k$ the set $\mathcal{V}^k_{2m+2} = \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \bigcup_{i,j=1}^{k} \bigcup_{q=1}^{2k-m-1} \left(\mathrm{Q}^3_{\frac{h}{2}}(\alpha_{i,j,q}) \cup \mathrm{Q}^3_{\frac{h}{2}}(\alpha_{i,j,q})\right)$. We have in view of (4.62) for $(x_1,x_2,x_3) \in \mathcal{V}^k_{2m+2}$

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(x_1,x_2,x_3,\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+2}) = \Psi_\varrho\left(\mathcal{L}^{k,\perp} - (2 + \frac{(2m+1)h}{2})\vec{e}_3\right) \vee_3 \Psi_\varrho\left(\mathcal{L}^k\right)(x_1,x_2,x_3),$$

whereas we have, for $q = 1, \ldots, 2k-m-1$ the identity

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(x_1,x_2,x_3,\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+2}) = \gamma^-_{\frac{h}{2}}(x - \alpha_{i,j,q}) \text{ for } (x_1,x_2,x_3) \in \mathrm{Q}^3_{\frac{h}{2}}(\alpha_{i,j,q}).$$

We define $\mathfrak{C}_k$ on the strip $\mathfrak{B}_{2m+3} = \mathbb{R}^3 \times [\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+2}, \mathcal{T}^k_{2m+3}]$ as

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(x) = \boxdot_{\varrho,\frac{h}{2}}(x - \mathfrak{a}^k_{i,j,q,m}) = \mathfrak{E}\mathrm{xt}_{r,0}(\gamma_{\varrho,\frac{h}{2}}(\cdot - \mathfrak{a}^k_{i,j,q,m}))(x) \text{ for } x \in \mathrm{Q}^k_{i,j,q,m}.$$

so that at time $\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+3}$ the map $\mathfrak{C}_k$ is of the form (4.55), with the index m replaced by $m+1$, allowing hence to iterate the construction. the map $\mathfrak{C}_k$ is Lipshitz on $\mathbb{R}^3 \times [\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+1}, \mathcal{T}^k_{2m+3}]$ except on the discrete set $\mathcal{Z}^k_m$ given for $m \geq k$

$$\mathcal{Z}^k_{m+1} = \bigcup_{i,j=1}^{k} \bigcup_{q=1}^{2k-m-1} \{\mathfrak{a}_{i,j,q,m+1}\} \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \times [\mathcal{T}^k_{2m+1}, \mathcal{T}^k_{2m+3}], \tag{4.63}$$

each of the $k^2(2k-m-1)$ points in $\mathcal{Z}^k_{m+1}$ being a singularity of $\mathfrak{C}_k$ of Hopf invariant equal to $+2$. As above we have the energy estimate

$$\int_{\mathfrak{B}^k_{2m+1}\cup\mathfrak{B}^k_{2m+2}} |\nabla \mathfrak{C}_k|^3 \leq Ck^2. \tag{4.64}$$

The iteration is stopped when $m=2k$, hence at step $4k+1$, that is at time $\mathcal{T}^k_{4k+1}=6+\frac{h}{2}$. Then, all fibers of $\mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}^k_{4k+1})$ have left the crossing region and the two sheafs $\mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}(\mathcal{T}^k_{4k+1})$ and $\mathfrak{L}^k$ are not longer linked. In particular, we observe that

$$\mathrm{H}\left(\mathfrak{C}_k(\cdot,\mathcal{T}^k_{4k+1})\right)=0. \tag{4.65}$$

Moreover, the map $\mathfrak{C}_k$ has $\dfrac{k^3(k-1)}{2}$ singularities on $\mathbb{R}^3\times[\mathcal{T}^k_{2k+2},\mathcal{T}^k_{4k+1}]$ of Hopf invariant equal to $+2$. If we denote by Υ^k the set of all singularities created so far, then

$$\Upsilon^k=\Upsilon^k_1\cup\Upsilon^k_2, \text{where } \Upsilon^k_1=\bigcup_{m=0}^{k}\mathcal{Z}^k_m \text{ and } \Upsilon^k_2=\bigcup_{m=k+1}^{2k}\mathcal{Z}^k_m, \tag{4.66}$$

where the sets $\mathcal{Z}^k_m$ are defined in (4.61) and (4.63). The number of elements in Υ^k is equal to k^4, each singularity being of topological charge $+2$. Notice moreover that the map $\mathfrak{C}_k$ constructed on has compact support in $[-20,20]^3\times[0,\mathcal{T}^k_{4k+1}]=[-20,20]^3\times[0,6+\frac{h}{2}]$.

Step $4k+2$: deforming to a constant map. We deform next $\mathfrak{C}_k(\cdot,\mathcal{T}^k_{4k+1})$ to a constant map using the extension operator again. We consider for that purpose the 4-dimensional cube $\mathrm{Q}^4_{20}(O^h)$ where $O^h=(0,0,0,26+\frac{h}{2})$. We define $\mathfrak{C}_k$ on the complement of the cube as

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4)=\mathrm{P}_{\text{south}} \text{ for } (x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4)\notin \mathrm{Q}^4_{20}(O^h) \text{ and } x_4\geq \mathcal{T}^k_{4k+1}\equiv 6+\frac{h}{2},$$

So that $\mathfrak{C}_k$ is now defined on the boundary $\partial(\mathrm{Q}^4_{20}(O^h))$, is Lipschitz there and satisfies

$$\int_{\partial(\mathrm{Q}^4_{20}(O^h))}|\nabla\mathfrak{C}_k|^3\leq C\int_{x_4=\mathcal{T}^k_{4k+1}}|\nabla\mathfrak{C}_k|^3\leq Ck^3. \tag{4.67}$$

We then extend $\mathfrak{C}_k$ as a map $\tilde{\mathfrak{C}}^k$ to the interior of the cube setting

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{C}}^k(x)=\mathfrak{E}\mathrm{xt}_{(20,O^h)}(\mathfrak{C}_k|_{\partial(\mathrm{Q}^4_{20}(O^h))})(x)=\mathfrak{C}_k\left(O^h+20\frac{x-O^h}{|x-O^h|_\infty}\right) \text{ for } x\in\mathrm{Q}^4_{20}(O^h). \tag{4.68}$$

It follows that $\tilde{\mathfrak{C}_k}$ is Lipschitz except at the point O^h which is in view of (4.65) of topological charge equal to 0. Hence, it follows from Lemma 4.3 that we may be approximation remove the singularity, and define hence the map $\mathfrak{C}_k$ on the interior of $\mathrm{Q}^4_{20}(O^h)$ in such a way that $\mathfrak{C}_k$ is smooth there and

$$\int_{\mathrm{Q}^4_{20}(O^h)}|\nabla\mathfrak{C}_k|^3\leq 2\int_{\mathrm{Q}^4_{20}(O^h)}|\nabla\tilde{\mathfrak{C}}^k|^3 \tag{4.69}$$

Estimating the r.h.s of (4.69) thanks to (4.67) and (4.11) and then combining with (4.69), we deduce that

$$\int_{x_4\geq\mathcal{T}^k_{4k+1}}|\nabla\mathfrak{C}_k|^3\leq Ck^3, \tag{4.70}$$

so that $\mathfrak{C}_k$ belongs to Y_k defined in (32) with singular set described by Υ_k, each singularity having topological charge equal, to $+2$.

Proof of Proposition 4 completed. The energy estimate (33) is derived combining our various energy estimates (4.31), (4.40), (4.51), (4.57), (4.60), (4.64) and finally (4.70). A complete description of the set of singularities has been established in the course of the proof in (4.66) combined with the definitions (4.61) and (4.63) of the set $\mathcal{Z}_m^k$ as well as the definition (4.26) of the points $\mathfrak{a}_{i,j,q,r}$. Property (34) then follows directly from this description and the proof of Proposition 4 is complete.

5 Proof of the main results

5.1 Proof of Proposition 2

5.1.1 Constructing the sequence $(\mathfrak{v}_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$

The maps $\mathfrak{v}_k$ are directly deduced from the maps $\mathfrak{C}_k$ described in Proposition performing a few elementary transformations. Notice first that the map $\mathfrak{C}_k$ is only defined on the strip Λ defined in (31). Given an integer $k \in \mathbb{N}^\star$, we first extend the map $\mathfrak{C}_k$ to the whole half-space $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, +\infty)$ setting

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(x', s) = \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}} \text{ for } x' \in \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ and } s' \geq 30,$$

so that this extension is in $W^{1,3}(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R}^3) + \{\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}}\}$. We then extend $\mathfrak{C}_k$ to the whole space by reflection according to the hyperplane $\mathbb{R}^3 \times \{0\}$ setting

$$\mathfrak{C}_k(x', s) = \mathfrak{C}_k(x', -s) \text{ for } x' \in \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ and } s' \leq 0,$$

so that this extension belongs to $W^{1,3}(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^3) + \{\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}}\}$ and is constant outside the ball $\mathbb{B}^4(30)$, equal to $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}}$ on $\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus \mathbb{B}^4(30)$. Moreover, we have, in view of (33)

$$\mathrm{E}_3(\mathfrak{C}_k, \mathbb{R}^4) \leq 20\mathrm{C}_{spg} k^3.$$

After these extensions, we modify $\mathfrak{C}_k$ through a linear transformation introducing the map $\tilde{\mathfrak{C}}_k = \mathfrak{C}_k \circ \mathcal{H}$, where $\mathcal{H}$ is the linear mapping of $\mathbb{R}^4$ defined by $\mathcal{H}(x', s) = (x', \frac{s}{2})$, for $x' \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$ so that

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{C}}_k(x', s) = \mathfrak{C}_k(x', \frac{s}{2}).$$

The singular set of $\tilde{\mathfrak{C}}_k$ contains now $2k^4$ elements and is actually given by

$$\tilde{\Upsilon}^k = \tilde{\Upsilon}^{k,+} \cup \tilde{\Upsilon}^{k,-} \text{ where } \tilde{\Upsilon}^{k,+} = \mathcal{H}(\Upsilon^k) \text{ and } \tilde{\Upsilon}^{k,-} = -\mathcal{H}(\Upsilon^k),$$

the singularities in $\tilde{\Upsilon}^{k,-}$ having all a topological charge equal to -2 whereas to ones in $\tilde{\Upsilon}^{k,-}$ have charge $+2$. Notice that on $\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus \tilde{\Upsilon}^k$, the map $\mathfrak{C}_k$ is locally lipschitz on any compact subset. Introducing the point $A_0^h = (0, -1-h, -\frac{1}{8}h, 2)$ and the parallelepiped $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{ox}} = [0,1]^3 \times [-1,1]$ we have, in view of (36)

$$A_0^h + \boxplus_{\frac{k}{2}}^m(h) \subset \tilde{\Upsilon}^{k,+} \subset A_0^h + \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{ox}},$$

where the set $\boxplus_k^m$ is defined in (35). Since we wish to have compact support in $\mathbb{B}^4$, we finally set

$$\mathfrak{v}_k(x) = \tilde{\mathfrak{C}}_{2k}(40x) \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}^4$$

so that $\mathfrak{v}_k(x) = \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^4 \setminus \mathbb{B}^4$ and

$$\mathrm{E}_3(\mathfrak{v}_k, \mathbb{R}^4) \leq \mathrm{C}_1 k^3,$$

hence (22) is established. If we denote by $\check{\Upsilon}^k$ the singular set of $\mathfrak{v}_k$, then we have

$$\check{\Upsilon}^k = \frac{1}{40}\tilde{\Upsilon}^k = \frac{1}{40}\tilde{\Upsilon}^{2k,+} \cup \frac{1}{40}\tilde{\Upsilon}^{2k,-} = \check{\Upsilon}^{k,+} \cup \check{\Upsilon}^{k,-} \text{ with } \check{\Upsilon}^{k,+} \cap \check{\Upsilon}^{k,-} = \emptyset.$$

It contains $32k^4$ singularities, the singularities in $\check{\Upsilon}^{k,+}$ having topological charge $+2$, the singularities in $\check{\Upsilon}^{k,}$ having topological charge -2. Moreover, we have

$$\check{A}_0^h + \boxplus_k^m(\frac{h}{40}) \subset \check{\Upsilon}^{k,+} \subset \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{ox}}^h \equiv \check{A}_0^h + \check{\mathrm{B}}_{\mathrm{ox}}, \text{ with } \check{A}_0^h = \frac{1}{40}A_0^h \text{ and } \check{\mathrm{B}}_{\mathrm{ox}} = \frac{1}{40}\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{ox}}. \tag{5.1}$$

Notice also that

$$\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{ox}}^h \cap \check{\Upsilon}^{k,-} = \emptyset.$$

5.1.2 On the singularities of $\mathfrak{v}_k$

In order to prove (23), we will rely on some additional notion related to branched transportation which are exposed in Appendix A, in particular the branched connection to the boundary $\mathfrak{L}^{\alpha}_{\mathrm{brbd}}$, with the exponent α equal to the critical exponent in dimension 4, namely $\alpha_4 = \frac{3}{4}$.

Proposition 5.1. *We have the lower bound, for some universal constant $C > 0$*

$$\mathfrak{L}^{\alpha_4}_{\mathrm{brbd}}(\check{\Upsilon}^{k,+}, \partial \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{ox}}^h) \geq Ck^3 \log k, \quad \text{for any } k \in \mathbb{N}^*.$$

Proof. It follows from (5.1) that, with $\check{\mathrm{B}}_{\mathrm{ox}}$ defined there

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{L}^{\alpha_4}_{\mathrm{brbd}}(\check{\Upsilon}^{k,+}, \partial \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{ox}}^h) &\geq \mathfrak{L}^{\alpha_4}_{\mathrm{brbd}}(\check{A}_0^h + \boxplus_k^m(\frac{h}{40}), \partial \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{ox}}^h) = \mathfrak{L}^{\alpha_4}_{\mathrm{brbd}}(\boxplus_k^m(\frac{h}{40}), \partial \check{\mathrm{B}}_{\mathrm{ox}}) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{40}\mathfrak{L}^{\alpha_4}_{\mathrm{brbd}}(\boxplus_k^m(h), \partial \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{ox}}) \geq \frac{1}{40}\Lambda_4^{\alpha_4}(k). \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

The conclusion then is a direct consequence of Proposition A.1 of the Appendix.

□

5.1.3 Proof of Proposition 2 completed

The only part of proposition 2 which has to be established is (23). For that purpose, we invoke the relationship between the functionals $\mathfrak{L}^{\alpha}_{\mathrm{branch}}$ and $\mathfrak{L}^{\alpha_4}_{\mathrm{brbd}}$ presented in Lemma A.5, choosing $\mathfrak{P} = \{1\}$ and $\Omega_1 = \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{ox}}^h$. Since all singularities in $\mathcal{O}_1^h$ have the same charge equal to $+2$, the conclusion applies showing that

$$\mathfrak{L}^{\alpha_4}_{\mathrm{branch}}(\mathfrak{v}_k) \geq \mathfrak{L}^{\alpha_4}_{\mathrm{brbd}}(\check{\Upsilon}^{k,+}, \partial \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{ox}}^h). \tag{5.3}$$

Combining inequality (5.3) with the result of Proposition 5.1, we are led to

$$\mathfrak{L}^{\alpha_4}_{\rm branch} r(\check{\Upsilon}^{k,+}, \partial \mathrm{B}^h_{\rm ox}) \geq Ck^3 \log k. \tag{5.4}$$

On the other hand, combining (11) and (10) with the respective definitions (20) and (A.41) of $\mathrm{L}_{\rm branch}$ and $\mathfrak{L}^{\alpha_4}_{\rm branch}$ respectively, we are led, for general singularities (P_i, Q_j) to the inequality

$$C_1 \mathfrak{L}^{\alpha_4}_{\rm branch}(P_i, Q_j) \leq \mathrm{L}_{\rm branch}(P_i, Q_j) \leq C_2 \mathfrak{L}^{\alpha_4}_{\rm branch}(P_i, Q_j), \tag{5.5}$$

whre $C_2 \geq C_1 > 0$ are constants. Inequality (23) then follows, combining (5.3), (5.4) and (5.5). The proof of Proposition 2 is complete.

5.2 Proof of Theorem 4

5.2.1 Sequences of radii and multiplicities

The following elementary observation will be used in our proof:

Lemma 5.1. *There exists a sequence of radii* $(\mathfrak{r}_\mathfrak{i})_{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathbb{N}}$ *and a sequence of integers* $(\mathrm{k}_\mathfrak{i})_{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathbb{N}}$ *such that the following properties are satisfied*

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathbb{N}} \mathfrak{r}_\mathfrak{i} = \frac{1}{8}, \quad \sum_{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathbb{N}} \mathfrak{r}_\mathfrak{i} \mathrm{k}_\mathfrak{i}^3 < +\infty \text{ and } \sum_{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathbb{N}} \mathfrak{r}_\mathfrak{i}\ \mathrm{k}_\mathfrak{i}^3\ \log(\mathrm{k}_\mathfrak{i}) = +\infty. \tag{5.6}$$

Proof. Consider first the sequences $(\tilde{\mathfrak{r}}_\mathfrak{i})_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(\tilde{\mathrm{k}}_\mathfrak{i})_{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathbb{N}}$ given for $i \in \mathbb{N}\setminus\{0,1\}$ by

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{r}}_i = \frac{1}{\mathfrak{i}^4(\log \mathfrak{i})^2} \text{ and } \mathrm{k}_i = \mathfrak{i},$$

so that

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{i}=2}^{+\infty} \tilde{\mathfrak{r}}_i = \sum_{\mathfrak{i}=2}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{i}^4(\log \mathfrak{i})^2} < +\infty, \ \sum_{\mathfrak{i}=2}^{+\infty} \tilde{\mathfrak{r}}_i\, \mathrm{k}_\mathfrak{i}^3 = \sum_{\mathfrak{i}=2}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{i}\,(\log \mathfrak{i})^2} < +\infty,$$

whereas

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{i}=2}^{+\infty} \tilde{\mathfrak{r}}_i\, \mathrm{k}_\mathfrak{i}^3 \log(\mathrm{k}_\mathfrak{i}) = \sum_{\mathfrak{i}=2}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{i}\,(\log \mathfrak{i})} = +\infty.$$

We then choose arbitrary values for $i = 0$ and $i = 1$ and finally set $\mathfrak{r}_i = \mathrm{c}\tilde{\mathfrak{r}}_i$, where the positive constant c is defined so that the first condition holds, that is satisfies $\mathrm{c}^{-1} = 8\sum_{\mathfrak{i}=0}^{+\infty} \tilde{\mathfrak{r}}_i$. □

5.2.2 Defining $\mathcal{U}$ gluing copies of the $\mathfrak{v}_k$'s

We introduce the set of points $\{\mathfrak{M}_\mathfrak{i}\}_{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathbb{R}^4$ defined by

$$\mathfrak{M}_\mathfrak{i} = 4\left(\sum_{j=0}^{\mathfrak{i}} \mathfrak{r}_\mathfrak{j}\right) \vec{e}_1 \text{ where } \vec{e}_1 = (1,0,0,0), \text{ for } \mathfrak{i} \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{5.7}$$

so that the points $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathfrak{i}}$ are all on the segment joining the origin to the point

$$\mathfrak{M}_\star = \frac{1}{2}\vec{e}_1 = (\frac{1}{2}, 0, \ldots, 0),$$

converging thanks to the first identity in (5.6), to the point $\mathfrak{M}_\star$ as $\mathfrak{i} \to +\infty$. We consider the collection of disjoint balls $(B_{\mathfrak{i}})_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ defined by

$$B_{\mathfrak{i}} \equiv \mathbb{B}^4(\mathfrak{M}_i, \mathfrak{r}_i) \text{ for } \mathfrak{i} \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ so that } \mathrm{dist}(B_{\mathfrak{i}}, B_{\mathfrak{j}}) \geq \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{i}} + \mathfrak{r}_j \text{ if } \mathfrak{i} \neq \mathfrak{j},$$

and then define the map $\mathcal{U}$ on $\mathbb{B}^4(1)$ as

$$\mathcal{U}(x) = \mathfrak{v}_{\mathfrak{k}_{\mathfrak{i}}}\left(\frac{x - \mathfrak{M}_{\mathfrak{i}}}{\mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{i}}}\right) \text{ if } x \in B_{\mathfrak{i}}, \ \mathcal{U}(x) = \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}} \text{ if } x \in \mathbb{B}^4(1) \setminus \underset{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathbb{N}}{\cup} B_{\mathfrak{i}}. \tag{5.8}$$

We have in particular $\mathcal{U} = \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}}$ on the boundary $\partial\mathbb{B}(1)$. Likewise we define a sequence of maps $(\mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{i}})_{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathbb{N}}$ setting for $\mathfrak{i} \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{i}}(x) = \mathcal{U}(x) \text{ if } x \in \overset{\mathfrak{i}}{\underset{\mathfrak{j}=0}{\cup}} B_{\mathfrak{j}}, \ \mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{i}} = \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}} \text{ otherwise.} \tag{5.9}$$

Since the map $\mathfrak{v}_k$ belongs to $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{Cte}}(\mathbb{B}^4, \mathbb{S}^2)$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows that for any $\mathfrak{i} \in \mathbb{N}$, the map $\mathcal{U}_i$ belongs to $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{Cte}}(\mathbb{B}^4, \mathbb{S}^2)$. On the over hand, the map $\mathcal{U}$ has an infinite countable number of singularities, whose only accumulation point is $\mathfrak{M}_\star$. We notice also that $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{i}}$ on any compact subset K of $\bar{\mathbb{B}}^4 \setminus \{\mathfrak{M}_\star\}$ provide $\mathfrak{i}$ is sufficiently large.

Lemma 5.2. *The map $\mathcal{U}$ belongs to $W^{1,3}_{\mathrm{Cte}}(\mathbb{B}^4, \mathbb{S}^2)$. Moreover*

$$\mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{i}} \to \mathcal{U} \text{ in } W^{1,3}(\mathbb{B}^4, \mathbb{R}^3) \text{ strongly as } \mathfrak{i} \to +\infty. \tag{5.10}$$

Proof. It follows from the definition (5.8), the scaling properties (5) of the energy E_3 and inequality (22) of Proposition 2 that

$$\mathrm{E}_3(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{B}^4) = \sum_{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathbb{N}} \mathrm{E}_3(\mathcal{U}, B_{\mathfrak{i}}) = \sum_{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathbb{N}} \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{i}}\mathrm{E}_3(\mathfrak{v}_{\mathfrak{k}_{\mathfrak{i}}}) \leq \mathrm{C}_1 \sum_{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathbb{N}} \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{i}}\mathfrak{k}_{\mathfrak{i}}^3 < +\infty$$

and likewise for $\mathfrak{i} \in \mathbb{N}$, we have the estimate

$$\mathrm{E}_3\left(\mathcal{U} - \mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{i}}, \mathbb{B}^4\right) = \sum_{\mathfrak{j}=\mathfrak{i}+1}^{+\infty} \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{j}}\mathrm{E}_3\left(\mathfrak{v}_{\mathfrak{k}_{\mathfrak{j}}}\right) \leq \sum_{\mathfrak{j}=\mathfrak{i}+1}^{+\infty} \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{j}}\mathfrak{k}_{\mathfrak{j}}^3 \to 0 \text{ as } j \to +\infty,$$

which establishes the assertions of the Lemma. □

We next turn to the description of some properties of the singular set $\mathcal{S}^{\mathrm{ing}}_{\mathfrak{i}} = \mathcal{S}^{\mathrm{ing},+}_{\mathfrak{i}} \cup \mathcal{S}^{\mathrm{ing},-}_{\mathfrak{i}}$ of $\mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{i}}$, where $\mathcal{S}^{\mathrm{ing},+}_{\mathfrak{i}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{S}^{\mathrm{ing},-}_{\mathfrak{i}}$) denotes the set of singularities of positive (resp. negative) topological charges, actually all equal to $+2$ (resp -2). We may write

$$\mathcal{S}^{\mathrm{ing},\pm} = \overset{\mathfrak{i}}{\underset{\mathfrak{j}=0}{\cup}} \Theta^{\pm}_{\mathfrak{j}} \text{ where } \Theta^{\pm}_{\mathfrak{j}} \equiv \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{j}}(\check{\Upsilon}^{k,\pm}) + \mathfrak{M}_{\mathfrak{j}}. \tag{5.11}$$

Invoking (5.1), we have hence, for any $\mathfrak{j} \in \mathbb{N}^\star$, setting $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{j}} = \mathfrak{k}_{\mathfrak{j}}^{-1}$

$$\mathfrak{M}^+_{\mathfrak{j}} + \boxplus^m_{\mathfrak{k}_{\mathfrak{j}}}(\frac{\mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{j}}\mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{j}}}{40}) \subset \check{\Theta}^+_{\mathfrak{j}} \subset \mathrm{B}^{\mathfrak{j}}_{\mathrm{ox}} \equiv \mathfrak{M}^{h,+}_{\mathfrak{j}} + \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{j}}\check{\mathrm{B}}_{\mathrm{ox}}, \tag{5.12}$$

where $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathfrak{j}}^{h,+} = \mathfrak{M}_{\mathfrak{i}} + \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{j}} \check{A}_1^{\mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{j}}}$. Moreover, we have

$$\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{ox}}^{\mathfrak{j}} \cap \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{i}}^{\mathrm{ing},-} = \emptyset,$$

so that arguing as in Proposition 5.1 and using the scaling properties of the branched transportation functional, we derive that, for any $\mathfrak{j} \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we have

$$\mathfrak{L}_{\mathrm{brbd}}^{\alpha_4}(\Theta_{\mathfrak{j}}^+, \partial \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{ox}}^{\mathfrak{j}}) \geq C\, \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{j}}\, \mathfrak{k}_{\mathfrak{j}}^3\, \log \mathfrak{k}_{\mathfrak{j}}. \tag{5.13}$$

5.2.3 Proof of theorem 4 completed

We argue by contradiction and assume that there exist a sequence $(v_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of maps in $C^\infty(\mathbb{B}^4, \mathbb{S}^2)$ such that

$$v_n \rightharpoonup \mathcal{U} \text{ weakly in } W^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^4, \mathbb{S}^2) \text{ as } n \to +\infty, \tag{5.14}$$

so that in particular, by the Banach-Steinhaus Theorem

$$\gamma \equiv \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \mathrm{E}_3\,(v_n, \mathbb{B}^4) < +\infty. \tag{5.15}$$

A variant of (18). In order to obtain a contradiction, and since the maps v_n are not necessary constant on the boundary, we will invoke a variant of (18), also proved in [20], which applies to that situation: If Ω is a smooth domain in $\mathbb{R}^4$, w is a map in $\mathcal{R}(\Omega, S^2)$ and $(\varphi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}^*}$ is a sequence of maps in $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}, \mathbb{S}^2)$ such that

$$\varphi_n \rightharpoonup w \text{ in } W^{1,3}(\Omega) \text{ as } n \to +\infty.$$

then, we have the lower bound

$$\liminf_{n\to+\infty} \mathrm{E}_3(\varphi_n) \geq \mathrm{E}_3(w) + \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{brbd}}(w, \partial\Omega). \tag{5.16}$$

The functional $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{brbd}}$ appearing on the r.h.s of (5.16) is defined, for an arbitrary $w \in \mathcal{R}(\Omega, \mathbb{S}^2)$ with ± 1 singularities as

$$\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{brbd}}(w, \partial\Omega) = \inf\{W_2(G), G \in \mathcal{G}(\{P_i\}_{i\in J^+}, \{Q\}_{j\in J^-}, \partial\Omega)\},$$

where $\{P_i\}_{i\in J^+}$ denotes set of $+1$ singularities of w, $\{Q_i\}_{i\in J^-}$ the set of negative singularities and $\mathcal{G}(\{P_i\}_{i\in J^+}, \{Q_j\}_{j\in J^-}, \partial\Omega)$ represents the set of graphs satisfying conditions (A.2) and (A.40) in the Appendix. Notice that, in view of (10) and (11), we have, similar to (5.5) for the same constants $0 < C_1 < C_2$

$$C_1 \mathfrak{L}_{\mathrm{brbd}}^{\alpha_4}(P_i, Q_j) \leq \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{brbd}}(P_i, Q_j) \leq C_2 \mathfrak{L}_{\mathrm{brbd}}^{\alpha_4}(P_i, Q_j). \tag{5.17}$$

Weak convergence to $\mathcal{U}_i$ on the sets $\Omega_{\mathfrak{i}}$. For given $\mathfrak{i} \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we consider the domain

$$\Omega_{\mathfrak{i}} = \mathbb{B}^4 \setminus \mathbb{B}^4(\mathfrak{M}^\star, \varrho_{\mathfrak{i}}) \text{ where } \varrho_{\mathfrak{i}} = 4\left(\sum_{\mathfrak{j}=\mathfrak{i}+1}^{+\infty} \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{j}}\right) + \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{i}+1} \to 0 \text{ as } \mathfrak{i} \to +\infty,$$

so that, in particular

$$\mathbb{B}(\mathfrak{M}_{\mathfrak{j}}, \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{j}}) \subset \Omega_{\mathfrak{i}} \text{ if } \mathfrak{j} \leq \mathfrak{i} \text{ and } \Omega_{\mathfrak{i}} \cap \mathbb{B}(\mathfrak{M}_{\mathfrak{j}}, \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{j}}) = \emptyset \text{ if } \mathfrak{j} > \mathfrak{i}.$$

Consider next the restriction $v_n^{\mathfrak{i}}$ of v_n to the set $\Omega_{\mathfrak{i}}$. It follows from (5.14) that

$$v_n^{\mathfrak{i}} \rightharpoonup \mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{i}} \text{ weakly in } W^{1,3}(\Omega_{\mathfrak{i}}, \mathbb{S}^2) \text{ as } n \to +\infty,$$

so that it follows from (5.16) and (5.15) that for any $\mathfrak{i} \in \mathbb{N}^*$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &\geq \liminf_{n\to+\infty} \mathrm{E}_3(v_n^{\mathfrak{i}}) \geq \mathrm{E}_3(\mathcal{U}_1) + \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{brbd}}(w, \partial\Omega) \\ &\geq C_1 \mathfrak{L}^{\alpha_4}_{\mathrm{brbd}}(\mathcal{S}^{\mathrm{ing},+}, \mathcal{S}^{\mathrm{ing},-}, \partial\Omega_{\mathfrak{i}}) = C_1 \mathfrak{L}^{\alpha_4}_{\mathrm{brbd}} \left(\bigcup_{\mathfrak{j}=1}^{\mathfrak{i}} \Theta_{\mathfrak{i}}^+, \bigcup_{\mathfrak{j}=1}^{\mathfrak{i}} \Theta_{\mathfrak{j}}^+, \partial\Omega_{\mathfrak{j}} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{5.18}$$

The contradiction. In view of (5.13), we may apply Lemma A.5 of the Appendix to the sets $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{ox}}^{\mathfrak{j}}$ and assert that

$$\mathfrak{L}^{\alpha_4}_{\mathrm{brbd}} \left(\bigcup_{\mathfrak{j}=1}^{\mathfrak{i}} \Theta_{\mathfrak{i}}^+, \bigcup_{\mathfrak{j}=1}^{\mathfrak{i}} \Theta_{\mathfrak{j}}^+, \partial\Omega_{\mathfrak{j}} \right) \geq \sum_{\mathfrak{j}=1}^{\mathfrak{i}} \mathfrak{L}^{\alpha_4}_{\mathrm{brbd}}(\Theta_{\mathfrak{j}}^+, \partial \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{ox}}^{\mathfrak{j}}) \geq C \sum_{\mathfrak{j}=1}^{\mathfrak{i}} \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{j}}\, \mathrm{k}_{\mathfrak{j}}^3\, \log \mathrm{k}_{\mathfrak{j}}, \tag{5.19}$$

where we have invoked (5.13) for the last inequality. Combining (5.18) and (5.19) we obtain that for $C \sum_{\mathfrak{j}=1}^{+\infty} \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{j}}\, \mathrm{k}_{\mathfrak{j}}^3\, \log \mathrm{k}_{\mathfrak{j}} \leq \gamma$, which contradicts property (5.6), and hence completes the proof of Theorem 4.

5.3 Proof of Theorem 3

5.3.1 Increasing and lowering dimensions

Adding dimensions. The construction described in this subsection yields another element in our Sobolev toolbox. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and consider a map $u : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^\ell$ such that u is constant equal to some value c_0 outside the unit ball $\mathbb{B}^m$. We construct a map $\mathfrak{I}^{m+1}(u)$ from $\mathbb{R}^{m+1} \to \mathbb{R}^\ell$ constant equal to c_0 outside in the unit ball $\mathbb{B}^{m+1}$ as follows. First, we consider the translated map $\tilde{u}$ defined on $\mathbb{R}^m$ by

$$\tilde{u}(x) = u(x - A) \text{ where } A = (2, 0, \ldots, 0),$$

so that $\tilde{u}$ is equal to c_0 outside the ball $\mathbb{B}_1(A)$. We then introduce the map $T^{m+1}(u)$ defined for $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m, x_{m+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ by

$$T^{m+1}(u)(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m, x_{m+1}) = \tilde{u}(\mathfrak{r}(x_1, x_2), x_3, x_4, \ldots, x_{m+1})$$

where we have set $\mathfrak{r}(x_1, x_{m+1}) = \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}$. the map that $T^{m+1}(u)$ possesses hence cylindrical symmetry around the $m-1$ hypersurface $x_1 = x_2 = 0$. It follows from the properties of u that $T^{m+1}(u)$ is equal to c_0 outside the $\mathbb{B}(3)$ and actually also on $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$. Since we wish the map to be constant outside the unit ball $\mathbb{B}(1)$ we normalize it and consider, for $x \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ the map $\mathfrak{I}^{m+1}(u)$ as

$$\mathfrak{I}^{m+1}(u)(x) = T^{m+1}(u)(3x), \tag{5.20}$$

so that $\mathfrak{I}^{m+1}(u)$ equals c_0 outside $B(1)$ and also

$$\mathfrak{I}^{m+1}(u)(x) = \mathrm{c}_0 \text{ for } x \in \mathfrak{A}^{m+1} \equiv [-\frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{6}]^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{m-1}.$$

Lowering dimensions. For $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, we consider the m-dimensional hyperplane $\mathcal{P}^m_\theta$ of $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{P}^m_\theta \equiv \text{Vect}\,\{\cos\theta\vec{e}_1 + \sin\theta\vec{e}_2,\, \vec{e}_3, \ldots,\, \vec{e}_{m+1}\}$$

and the half-hyperplane $\mathcal{P}^{m,+}_\theta$ defined by

$$\mathcal{P}^{m,+}_\theta = \{v \in \mathcal{P}^m_\theta, v.(\cos\theta\vec{e}_1 + \sin\theta\vec{e}_2) \geq 0\}. \tag{5.21}$$

Let $1 < p < +\infty$ and consider next a map $v \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^{m+1}, \mathbb{R}^\ell)$. Its restriction to the intersection of the half-hyperplane $\mathcal{P}^{m,+}_\theta$ with $\mathbb{B}^{m+1}(1)$ is in view of the trace theorem a map in $W^{1-\frac{1}{p},p}(\mathcal{P}^{m,+}_\theta \cap \mathbb{B}^m)$. It yields a map $\mathfrak{D}^m_\theta(v)$ defined on the m-dimensional ball $\mathbb{B}^m$ setting

$$\mathfrak{D}^m_\theta(v)(x_1, \ldots, x_m) = v(x_1\,\cos\theta, x_1\,\sin\theta,\, x_2, \ldots, x_m). \tag{5.22}$$

Notice that the two operators $\mathfrak{D}^m_\theta$ and $\mathfrak{I}^{m+1}$ are related through the identity

$$\mathfrak{D}^m_\theta \circ \mathfrak{I}^{m+1}(v) = w, \text{ for any } v \text{ with compact support in } \mathbb{B}^m \text{ and any } \theta \in \mathbb{R},$$

where the map w is defined by

$$w(x) = v(3x - A), \text{ for any } x \in \mathbb{B}^{m,+} \equiv \mathbb{B}^m \cap \{x_1 \geq 0\}.$$

We then have:

Lemma 5.3. *Let u be given in $W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{Cte}}(\mathbb{B}^m, \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ and assume that there exists a sequence of maps $(w_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^{m+1}, \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ such that*

$$w_n \rightharpoonup \mathfrak{I}^{m+1}(u)(x) \text{ weakly in } W^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^{m+1}, \mathbb{R}^\ell) \text{ as } n \to +\infty.$$

Then, there exists a subsequence $\left(w_{\sigma(n)}\right)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and a converging sequence of angles $(\theta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$\mathfrak{D}^m_{\theta_n}(w_{\sigma(n)})(\cdot) \rightharpoonup v \text{ weakly in } W^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^m, \mathbb{R}^\ell) \text{ as } n \to +\infty,$$

where the map v satisfies

$$v(x) = u(3\,x - A) \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{B}^{m,+} \equiv \mathbb{B}^m \cap \{x_1 \geq 0\}.$$

Proof. Since $\mathfrak{I}^{m+1}(u)$ is constant on the set $\mathfrak{A}^{m+1}$, and since the sequence $(w_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^{m+1}, \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ by Banach-Steinhaus theorem, we may invoke Fubini's theorem to assert that given any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists some angle $\tilde{\theta}_n \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\int_{\mathcal{P}^{m,+}_{\tilde{\theta}_n} \cap \mathbb{B}^{m+1}} |\nabla w_n|^p \leq C,$$

where $C > 0$ is some constant independent of n. It follows that the sequence $\mathfrak{D}^m_{\tilde{\theta}_n}(w_n)$ is bounded in $W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{Cte}}(\mathbb{B}^m, \mathbb{R}^\ell)$. By sequential weak compactness, we may extract a subsequence

$(\sigma(n))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\mathfrak{D}^m_{\tilde\theta_{\sigma(n)}}(w_{\sigma(n)})$ converges some map v in $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^m)$. Since by the trace theorem we already now that the sequence converges to the map v defined by $v(x) = u(3x-A)$, the conclusion follows, extracting possibly a further subsequence so that the sequences of angles converges.

□

In the case of maps with values into a compact manifolf $\mathcal{N}$ we are immediately led to the following.

Corollary 5.1. *Let u be given in $W^{1,p}_{\rm Cte}(\mathbb{B}^m,\mathcal{N})$. Assume that $\mathfrak{I}^{m+1}(u)$ is the weak limit in $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^{m+1},\mathbb{R}^\ell)$ of a sequence of maps $(w_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ belonging to $\mathbb{C}^\infty(\mathbb{B}^{m+1},\mathcal{N})$. Then u is also the weak limit in $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^m,\mathbb{R}^\ell)$ of a sequence of maps $(u_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of maps belonging to $\mathbb{C}^\infty(\mathbb{B}^{m+1},\mathcal{N})$.*

Proof. Applying Lemma 5.3 to the sequence w_n and setting $\tilde u_n = \mathfrak{D}^m_{\theta_n}(w_{\sigma(n)})$, we see that

$$\tilde u_n \rightharpoonup v \text{ weakly in } W^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^{m+1},\mathbb{R}^\ell) \text{ as } n\to+\infty \text{ where } v(x) = u(3x-A) \text{ on } \mathbb{B}^{m,+}.$$

We then define u_n by $u_n(x) = \tilde u_n(\dfrac{x+A}{3})$ for $x\in\mathbb{B}^m$, yielding the desired sequence of maps.

□

Iterating Corollary 5.1, we are led to

Corollary 5.2. *Let $m_0\in\mathbb{N}^*$, and qssume that there exists a map u in $W^{1,p}_{\rm Cte}(\mathbb{B}^{m_0},\mathcal{N})$ which is not the weak limit of smooth maps. That given any integer $m\geq m_0$ there exists a map v in $W^{1,p}_{\rm Cte}(\mathbb{B}^{m'},\mathcal{N})$ which is not the weak limit of smooth maps.*

The proof is straightforward and left to the reader.

5.3.2 Proof of Theorem 3 completed

In Theorem 3, we have constructed a map $\mathcal{U}$ in $W^{1,3}_{\rm Cte}(\mathbb{B}^4,\mathbb{S}^2)$ which is not the weal limit of smooth maps. Applying Corollary 5.2 with $m_0 = 4$, we deduce that for any given integer $m\geq 4$ there exists a map $\mathcal{V}_m$ in $W^{1,3}_{\rm Cte}(\mathbb{B}^m,\mathbb{S}^2)$ which is not the weak limit of maps in $C^\infty(\mathbb{B}^m,\mathbb{S}^2)$. This provides the proof of Theorem 3 in the special case $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{B}^m$.

We extend next the result to an arbitrary smooth manifold $\mathcal{M}$ of dimension m. For that purpose, we choose an arbitrary point A on $\mathcal{M}$ and glue a suitably adapted copy of $\mathcal{V}_m$ at the point A. More precisely, we consider for $\rho>0$ the geodedis ball $\mathcal{O}_\rho(A)$ centered at A. If ρ is choosen sufficiently small, then there exist a diffeomorphism $\Phi:\mathcal{O}_\rho(A)\to\mathbb{B}^m$ and we may define a map $\mathcal{W}:\mathcal{M}\to\mathbb{S}^2$ setting

$$\mathcal{W}(x) = \mathcal{V}\left(\Phi(x)\right) \text{ if } x\in\mathcal{O}_\rho(A),\ \mathcal{W}(x) = \mathrm{P}_{\rm south} \text{ otherwise.}$$

One may then verify that $\mathcal{W}$ belongs $W^{1,3}_{\rm Cte}(\mathcal{M},\mathbb{S}^2)$ and cannot be approximated weakly by maps in $C^\infty(\mathcal{M},\mathbb{S}^2)$, which completes the proof.

6 The lifting problem

6.1 Lifting the k-spaghetton map

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ be given and consider on $\mathbb{R}^3$ an arbitrary lifting U_k of the spaghetton map $\mathfrak{S}_k$, that is a map $\mathrm{U}^k : \mathbb{R}^3 \to SU(2) \simeq \mathbb{S}^3$ such that $\Pi \circ \mathrm{U}^k = \mathfrak{S}_k$. Although the relationship between U^k and $\mathfrak{S}_k$ has a genuine nonlocal nature, as suggestion by the relation (2.10), the peculiar geometry of the spaghetton map allows to recover some locality. This is expressed in the next lower bound.

Lemma 6.1. *Let U_k be any lipschitz lifting of the spaghetton map $\mathfrak{S}_k$, that is such that $\mathfrak{S}_k = \Pi \circ \mathrm{U}_k$. Then, we have, for every $1 \leq p < +\infty$*

$$\int_{\mathfrak{L}^k} |\nabla \mathrm{U}_k|^p \geq C_p k^{2p}, \tag{6.1}$$

where the constant $C_p > 0$ depends only on p.

Proof. As in subsection 2.2.1, we consider the $su(2)$ valued 1 form $A^k \equiv (\mathrm{U}^k)^{-1}.d\mathrm{U}^k$ and its first component the real-valued 1-form $A^k_1 = A^k.\sigma_1$, so that the curvature equation (2.5) yields the equation

$$dA^k_1 = 2\mathfrak{S}^*_k(\omega_{\mathbb{S}^2}). \tag{6.2}$$

Consider next an arbitrary planar curve $\mathcal{C}$ included in an affine plane of the form $P_{1,2}+(0,0,a)$ with $|a| \leq 1$, bounding a convex two dimensional domain Ω, and such that Ω contains the intersection $(P_{1,2} + (0,0,a)) \cap \mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp} \cap [0,1] \times [0,6] \times \mathbb{R}$. It follows that

$$|\int_\Omega u^*(\omega_{\mathbb{S}^2})| = \pi k^2.$$

Invoking Stokes theorem, the fact that $\mathcal{C} = \partial\Omega$ and (6.2) we deduce

$$|\int_{\mathcal{C}} A^k_1| = \frac{\pi}{2}k^2 \text{ and hence } \int_{\mathcal{C}} |\nabla \mathrm{U}_k| \geq \frac{\pi}{2}k^2. \tag{6.3}$$

We apply the upper bound (6.3) to the curves $\mathcal{C}^k_{i,q}(y)$, defined for $y \in \mathbb{S}^2$ and $i, q = i, \dots k$ as the pre-images $\mathcal{C}^k_{i,q}(y) \equiv [\Psi_\varrho(\mathfrak{L}^k_{i,j})]^{-1}(y)$. Notice that the union of these curves yields the set $\mathfrak{L}^k$. Integrating over all $y \in \mathbb{S}^2$, and summing up over i, q we are led, thanks to Fubini's theorem to the inequality

$$\int_{\mathfrak{L}^k} |\nabla \mathrm{U}_k| \geq \frac{\pi}{2}k^2,$$

which provides the proof of the lemma in case $p = 1$. For the other values of p, we invoke Hölder's inequality combined with the fact that there exists some constants $C_0 > 0$ and $C_1 > 0$ independent of k such that $C_0 \leq |\mathfrak{L}^k| \leq C_1$. □

Notice that, in view of Proposition 30, we have $|\nabla \mathfrak{S}_k| \leq \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{spg}} k$ so that, for any $1 \leq p < +\infty$, we have

$$\int_{\mathfrak{L}^k} |\nabla \mathfrak{S}_k|^p \leq C_p k^p, \tag{6.4}$$

which has to be compared with (6.1). The result in Lemma 6.1 carries over to some extend to Sobolev maps.

Lemma 6.2. *Let $2 \leq p < +\infty$ and $\mathrm{U}_k \in W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{S}^3)$ be such that $\mathfrak{S}_k = \Pi \circ \mathrm{U}_k$. Then (6.1) holds.*

Proof. In the case $p \geq 3$ smooth maps are dense in $W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{S}^3)$ and a standard approximation result yields the result. In the case $2 \leq p < 3$ smooth maps are no longer dense, but one may prove that, since the spaghetton map is smooth, any $W^{1,p}$ lifting of the spaghetton map can be approximated by smooth maps, yielding hence a similar proof. □

Remark 6.1. The result of Lemma 6.2 is non longer true for $1 \leq p < 2$. This observation related to the fact that there are lifting $W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{S}^3)$ which are singular, for instance on the fibers $\mathfrak{L}^k_{i,j}$ and $\mathfrak{L}^{k,\perp}_{i,j}$ (see e. g the corresponding results in [8]). Moreover, it that case, it is difficult to give a meaning to (6.2).

6.2 Adding dimensions

We add dimensions following the same scheme as in subsection 5.3.1. Since the spaghetton map $\mathfrak{S}_k$ is constant outside the ball $\mathbb{B}^4(17)$ we renormalize it first so to obtain a constant map outside the unit ball, introducing the map $\tilde{\mathfrak{S}_k} \equiv (\cdot) = \mathfrak{S}_k\,(17\cdot)$, and then consider the map

$$\mathfrak{S}^5_k = \mathfrak{J}^5(\tilde{\mathfrak{S}_k}))$$

which is a lipschitz map on $\mathbb{R}^5$ which is constant outside the unit ball $\mathbb{B}^5$. More generally, given $m \geq 5$, we define iteratively the map $\mathfrak{S}^m_k$ as

$$\mathfrak{S}^m_k = \mathfrak{J}^m(\mathfrak{S}^{m-1}_k))$$

with the convention $\mathfrak{S}^3_k = \tilde{\mathfrak{S}_k}$. In view of (6.4), we obtain the bound

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}^m} |\nabla \mathfrak{S}^m_k|^p \leq C k^p. \tag{6.5}$$

Lemma 6.3. *Let $2 \leq p < +\infty$ and $\mathrm{U}^m_k \in W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{B}^m, \mathbb{S}^3)$ be such that $\mathfrak{S}^m_k = \Pi \circ \mathrm{U}^m_k$. Then, we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}^m} |\nabla \mathrm{U}^m_k|^p \geq \mathrm{C}^m_p k^{2p}. \tag{6.6}$$

Proof. We establish inequality (6.6) arguing by induction on the dimension m. We first observe that the lower bound (6.6) has already been established for $m = 3$ in Lemma 6.2 with the choice of constant $\mathrm{C}^m_p = C_p$, where C_p refers to the constant in inequality (6.1). We next assume by induction that inequality (6.6) has been established some integer $m \geq 3$ and we are going to show that it then holds also in dimension $m + 1$. For that purpose, let $\mathrm{U}^{m+1}_k \in W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{B}^{m+1}, \mathbb{S}^3)$ be an arbitrary lifting of the map $\mathfrak{S}^{m+1}_k$. For $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$, we consider the half-hyperplane $\mathcal{P}^{m,+}_\theta$ defined in (5.21) and the map $\mathcal{D}_\theta(\mathrm{U}^{m+1}_k)$ defined on the m-dimensional ball $\mathbb{B}^m$ thanks to (5.22). It follows from these definitions that

$$\left(\Pi \circ \mathcal{D}_\theta(\mathrm{U}^{m+1}_k)\right)(x) = \mathfrak{S}^m_k(3x - A) \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{B}^{m,+}.$$

Hence, since by induction we assume that (6.6) holds in dimension m, we are led to the lower bound

$$\int_{\mathcal{P}^{m,+}_\theta \cap \mathbb{B}^m(\frac{1}{3}A, \frac{1}{3})} |\nabla \mathrm{U}^{m+1}_k|^p \geq \mathrm{C}^m_p \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^{m-p} k^{2p}.$$

Integrating with respect to θ on the interval $(0, 2\pi)$ we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}^{m+1}} |\nabla \mathrm{U}_k^{m+1}|^p \geq \mathrm{C}_p^m \frac{2\pi}{3} \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^{m-p} k^{2p},$$

so that the property (6.6) is established for the dimension $m+1$ choosing the constant C_p^{m+1} as $\mathrm{C}_p^{m+1} = 2\pi \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^{m+1-p} \mathrm{C}_p^m$. □

6.3 Proof of Theorem 5

We first construct a map $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_0$ in the special case $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{B}^m$, imposing moreover the additional condition $\mathcal{V}_0 = \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}}$ on $\partial\mathbb{B}^m$.

6.3.1 Construction of $\mathcal{V}_0$ on $\partial\mathbb{B}^m$.

Gluing copies of the $\mathfrak{S}_k^m$'s. We construct as in subsection 5.2.1 a sequence of radii $(\mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{i},p})_{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathbb{N}^*}$ and a sequence of integers $(\mathrm{k}_{\mathfrak{i},p})_{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that the following properties are satisfied:

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathbb{N}} \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{i},p} = \frac{1}{8}, \quad \sum_{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathbb{N}} \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{i},p}^{m-p} \mathrm{k}_{\mathfrak{i},p}^p < +\infty \text{ and } \sum_{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathbb{N}} \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{i},p}^{m-p}\, \mathrm{k}_{\mathfrak{i},p}^{2p} = +\infty. \tag{6.7}$$

In the case $m-p>1$, a possible choice for these sequences is given, for $\mathfrak{i} \geq 2$, by $\mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{i}} = \dfrac{\mathrm{c}}{\mathfrak{i}(\log \mathfrak{i})^2}$ and $\mathrm{k}_{\mathfrak{i}} = \left[\mathfrak{i}^{\frac{m-p-1}{p}}\right]$, where $\mathrm{c} = \dfrac{1}{8}\displaystyle\sum_{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{i}(\log \mathfrak{i})^2}$. In the case $0 < m-p \leq 1$, we may choose instead for $\mathfrak{i} \geq 2$, $\mathfrak{r}_i = \mathfrak{i}^{-\frac{3}{m-p}}$ and $\mathrm{k}_{\mathfrak{i}} = \mathfrak{i}^{\frac{1}{p}}$.

We define as above the set of points $\{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathfrak{i}}\}_{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathbb{B}^m$ by $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathfrak{i}} = 4\left(\displaystyle\sum_{j=0}^{\mathfrak{i}} \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{i}}\right)\vec{e}_1$ where $\vec{e}_1 = (1, 0, \ldots, 0)$, for $\mathfrak{i} \in \mathbb{N}$, so that these points converge to $\mathfrak{M}_\star = \frac{1}{2}\vec{e}_1$ as $\mathfrak{i} \to +\infty$, and consider the collection of disjoint balls $(B_{\mathfrak{i}})_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ defined by $B_{\mathfrak{i}} \equiv \mathbb{B}^m(\mathfrak{M}_i, \mathfrak{r}_i)$ for $\mathfrak{i} \in \mathbb{N}$. We then define the map $\mathcal{V}_0$ on $\mathbb{B}^m$ as

$$\mathcal{V}_0(x) = \mathfrak{S}_{\mathrm{k}_{\mathfrak{i}}}\left(\frac{x - \mathfrak{M}_{\mathfrak{i}}}{\mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{i}}}\right) \quad \text{if } x \in B_{\mathfrak{i}}, \quad \mathcal{U}(x) = \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}} \quad \text{if } x \in \mathbb{B}^4(1) \setminus \underset{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathbb{N}}{\cup} B_{\mathfrak{i}}. \tag{6.8}$$

so that $\mathcal{V}_0 = \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}}$ on the boundary $\partial\mathbb{B}^m$. Invoking the scaling properties (5) of the p-energy, we are led to

$$\mathrm{E}_p(\mathcal{V}_0, \mathbb{B}^m) = \sum_{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathbb{N}} \mathrm{E}_p(\mathcal{V}_0, B_{\mathfrak{i}}) = \sum_{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathbb{N}} \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{i}}^{m-p} \mathrm{E}_p(\mathfrak{S}_{\mathrm{k}_{\mathfrak{i}}}) \leq \mathrm{C} \sum_{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathbb{N}} \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{i}}^{m-p} \mathrm{k}_{\mathfrak{i}}^p < +\infty,$$

so that $\mathcal{V}_0$ belongs to $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^m, \mathbb{S}^2)$. Next assume that there exists a lifting U_0 of $\mathcal{V}_0$ in $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^m, \mathbb{S}^3)$ and consider its restriction $\mathrm{U}_{\mathfrak{i}}$ to the ball $B_{\mathfrak{i}}$. It follows from Lemma 6.3 and the scaling properties of the energy that

$$\mathrm{E}_p(\mathrm{U}_0, B_{\mathfrak{i}}) \geq C_p^m \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{i}}^{m-p} \mathrm{k}_{\mathfrak{i}}^p \text{ and hence } \mathrm{E}_p(\mathrm{U}_0, \mathbb{B}^m) \geq C_p^m \sum_{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathbb{N}} \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{i}}^{m-p} \mathrm{k}_{\mathfrak{i}}^p = +\infty,$$

leading to a contradiction, which established the proof of the theorem in the special case considered in this subsection.

6.3.2 Proof of Theorem 5 completed for a general manifold $\mathcal{M}$

The argument is somewhat parallel to the argument in subsection 5.3.2. With the same notation, we set

$$\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_0\left(\Phi(x)\right) \text{ if } x \in \mathcal{O}_a, \mathcal{V} = \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{south}} \text{ otherwise,}$$

and we verify that the map $\mathcal{V}$ has the desired property.

Appendix: related notions on branched transportation

In this Appendix we recall and recast some aspects of branched transportation which are directly related to our discussion, trying to keep however this part *completely* self-contained.

We assume that we are given a number $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, a lipschitz open bounded domain Ω of $\mathbb{R}^m$ with $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and a finite set A. Our aim is to model directed graphs connecting the set A to the boundary $\partial\Omega$, with a special emphasis on the critical case $\alpha = \alpha_m = 1 - 1/m$. Our presentation closely follows [28, 29] and also the general presentation in [4]. However, as far as we are aware of, the main result of this Appendix, presented in Theorem A.1, is new.

A.1 Directed graphs connecting a finite set to the boundary

A.1.1 Directed graphs and the Kirchhoff law

As in subsection 1.2, we consider here directed graphs G with finite vertex set $V(G) \subset \bar{\Omega}$ and a finite directed set $E(G)$ of segments joining the vertices: if e is a segment $E(G)$, then we denote by e^- and e^+ the endpoints of e belonging to $V(G)$. Given $a \in V(G)$, we set

$$E^{\pm}(a, G) = \{e \in E(G), e^{\pm} = a\}.$$

We assume that

$$A \subset V(G) \subset \bar{\Omega}, \tag{A.1}$$

that

$$\text{if } [e^-, e^+] \in E(G) \text{ then } [e^+, e^-] \notin E(G) \tag{A.2}$$

and furthermore that, given $a \in V(G) \setminus \partial\Omega$ we have

$$\begin{cases} \sharp\left(E^-(a, G)\right) = \sharp\left(E^+(a, G)\right) + 1 \text{ if } a \in A \\ \sharp\left(E^-(a, G)\right) = \sharp\left(E^+(a, G)\right) \text{ if } a \in V(G) \cap \Omega \setminus A, \end{cases} \tag{A.3}$$

Assumption (A.3) is somehow analogous to the Kirchhoff's law. We set

$$\mathcal{G}(A, \partial\Omega) = \{G \text{ such that (A.1), (A.2) and (A.3) hold}\}.$$

It can then be shown for graphs in $\mathcal{G}(A, \partial\Omega)$ that there exists a *unique* function $d : V(G) \to \mathbb{N}$ such that, if $a \in V(G) \setminus \partial\Omega$ then we have

$$\sum_{e \in E(G), e^- = a} d(e) = \underset{\substack{e \in E(G) \\ e^+ = a}}{d}(e) + \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } & a \in A \\ 0 \text{ otherwise} & \end{cases}, \tag{A.4}$$

The reader may also verify that, if $G \in \mathcal{G}(A, \partial\Omega)$ then necessarily we have

$$\sum_{e^+ \in \partial\Omega} d(e) - \sum_{e^- \in \partial\Omega} d(e) = \sharp(A),$$

where $\sharp(A)$ denotes the number of elements in A. It follows in particular that, if A is non-empty, then $V(G) \cap \partial\Omega \neq \emptyset$. The simplest example G_0 of an element in $\mathcal{G}(A, \partial\Omega)$ is provided by the graph for which each element a in A is connected to an element of the boundary b so that in this case $V(G_0) = \underset{a \in A}{\cup}\{a, b\}$ and the elements in the set $E(G)$ are geodesic segments joining the points a to the points b.

It is worthwhile noticing also that $\mathcal{G}(\emptyset, \partial\Omega) \neq \emptyset$. It contains in particular loops and threads connecting points on the boundary, as seen in the next paragraph.

A.1.2 Elementary operations on directed graphs

Gluing. The first operation we consider is the gluing of graphs. Let A_1 and A_2 be two finite disjoints subsets in Ω, et G_1 and G_2 be two graphs in $\mathcal{G}(A_1, \partial\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{G}(A_2, \partial\Omega)$ respectively. We assume furthermore that if

$$\begin{cases} \text{if } e = [e^-, e^+] \in E(G_1) \text{ (resp. } E(G_2)) \text{ then } -e \equiv [e^+, e^-] \notin E(G_2) \text{ (resp. } E(G_1)) \\ \text{if } e_1 \in E(G_1),\ e_2 \in E(G_2) \text{ then } e_1 = e_2 \text{ or } e_1 \cap e_2 \text{ contains at most one point.} \end{cases} \tag{A.5}$$

We then consider the graph

$$G = G_1 \curlyvee G_2 \in \mathcal{G}(A_1 \cup A_2, \partial\Omega), \tag{A.6}$$

such that its vertex set is provided by

$$V(G) = V(G_1) \cup V(G_2)$$

and its set of directed segments is given likewise by

$$E(G) = E(G_1) \cup E(G_2).$$

We notice that if d_1 and d_2 are the multiplicity functions for G_1 and G_2 respectively, then we have, in view of condition (A.5), for any segment $e \in E(G)$

$$d(e) = d_1(e) + d_2(e). \tag{A.7}$$

Subgraphs. Let A and B be two finite subsets in Ω, let G_A (resp. G_B) be a graph in $\mathcal{G}(A, \partial\Omega)$ (resp. in $\mathcal{G}(B, \partial\Omega)$). We say that G_B is a subgraph of G_A if we have

$$B \subset A,\ V(G_B) \subset V(G_A) \text{ and } E(G_B) \subset E(G_A). \tag{A.8}$$

If (A.8) is fullfilled, then we write $B \Subset A$. It may be proved that, if $B \Subset A$, then

$$d_B(e) \leq d_A(e), \text{ for any } e \in E(G_B).$$

Setting $C = A \setminus B$, we may show, invoking in particular (A.7), that there exists a unique graph G_C in $\mathcal{G}(B, \partial\Omega)$ having the following property

$$G_A = G_B \curlyvee G_C.$$

We then write $G_C = G_A \diagdown G_B$.

Restrictions of graphs to subdomains. Let $\Omega_1 \subset \Omega$ be a subdomain of Ω and G a graph in $\mathcal{G}(A, \partial\Omega)$. We define the restriction G_1 of G to Ω_1 as the graph such that

$$V(G_1) = (V(G) \cap \Omega_1) \cup \left(\underset{e \in E(G)}{\cup} \left(\bar{e} \cap \bar{\Omega}_1 \right) \right)$$

and with directed segment set

$$E(G) = \{ e \cap \bar{\Omega}_1, e \in E(G) \}.$$

We then set $G_1 = G \llcorner \Omega_1$. One may check that $G_1 \in \mathcal{G}(A \cap \Omega_1, \partial\Omega_1)$.

A.1.3 Curves, loops and threads

A heuristic image of the notion of thread we describe next, is provided by a a curve for with one end in given by a point in A, reaching to the boundary $\partial\Omega$, and constructed using only segments in $E(G)$. This suggest the following definition.

Definition A.1. *A directed graph G is said to be a polygonal curve in Ω, in short a P_Ω-curve, if and only if there exists an ordered collection $B = (b_1, \ldots, b_{\mathrm{q}})$ of q not necessary distinct points in $\bar{\Omega}$ such that G satisfies $V(G) = B$, relation* (A.2),

$$E(G) = \{[b_i, b_{i+1}], i = 1, \ldots, \mathrm{q}_1\} \text{ and } b_{\mathrm{q}} \in \partial\Omega \text{ or } b_{\mathrm{q}} = b_1.$$

Since the P_Ω-curve G is completely determined by the orderet set B, we may set

$$G = \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{rp}}(B).$$

Definition A.2. *Let $G = \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{rp}}(B)$ be a P_Ω-curve. We say that $\mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{rp}}(B)$ is*

- *a loop if either $b_1 = b_{\mathrm{q}}$ or $b_1 \in \partial\Omega$ and $b_{\mathrm{q}} \in \partial\Omega$.*
- *A thread emanating from a point $a \in \Omega$ if $a = b_1$ and $b_{\mathrm{q}} \in \partial\Omega$.*

The reader may check that every loop is an element in $\mathcal{G}(\emptyset, \partial\Omega)$, whereas a thread is an element of $\mathcal{G}(\{a\}, \partial\Omega)$. We say that a thread $G = \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{rp}}(B)$ is *without loop* if there exists no subset formed of consecutive points in B yielding a loop. Given a point $a \in \Omega$ we denote by $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{hread}}(a, \partial\Omega)$ will represent the sets of all threads *without loops emanating* from a. Given a finite subset A of Ω and an element $G \in \mathcal{G}(A, \partial\Omega)$ we denote by $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{hread}}(a, G, \partial\Omega)$ the set of all threads emanating from a withare subgraphs of G. Likewise, we denote by $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{oop}}(\Omega)$ the set of loops. On may verify that given any thread T, there exists a finite family $(L_j)_{j\in J}$ of loops such that

$$T = T_a \curlyvee \left(\curlyvee_{j\in J} L_j \right) \text{ with } T_a \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{hread}}(a, G, \partial\Omega).$$

One may also verify that given a family $(T_a)_{a\in A}$ of threads without loop satisfying condition (A.5), then the graph

$$G = \curlyvee_{a\in A} T_a$$

has no loops.

A.1.4 Decomposing graphs into threads and loops

Decomposition results. The following result is an important tool:

Proposition A.1. *Let $G \in \mathcal{G}(A, \partial\Omega)$. We may decompose the graph G as*

$$G = \left(\curlyvee_{a\in A} T_a \right) \curlyvee T_0 \text{ with } T_a \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{hread}}(a, G, \partial\Omega) \text{ and } T_0 \in \mathcal{G}(\emptyset, \partial\Omega). \tag{A.9}$$

Proof. As a preliminary remark, we observe first that, given a graph $G \in \mathcal{G}(A, \partial\Omega)$, it follows from property (A.3) that

$$\sharp\left(E^-(b,G)\right) \geq \sharp\left(E^+(b,G)\right) \text{ for any } b \in V(G) \cap \Omega. \tag{A.10}$$

Since A is finite, we may write $A = \{a_1, \ldots, a_P\}$. We construct next the subgraphs T_{a_1}.

Step 1: construction of T_{a_1}. We notice first that, as a consequece of (A.1) and (A.10), the set $E^-(a_1, G)$ is not empty. Hence we may choose a directed segment $[a, b_2]$ in $E(G)$, with $b_2 \in V(G)$. If b_2 belongs to the boundary $\partial\Omega$, then we set

$$T_{a_1} = \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{rp}}(B_2), \text{ where } B_2 = (b_1, b_2), \text{ with } b_1 = a_1,$$

and we verify that T_{a_1} belongs to $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{hread}}(a, G, \partial\Omega)$. If instead $b_2 \notin \partial\Omega$, then we go on and invoke (A.10) for the point b_2, so that we may choose some segment $[b_2, b_3] \in E(G)$. Moreover, in view of the Kirchhoff law (A.3), we may choose b_3 in such a way that $b_3 \neq b_1$. If b_3 belongs to the boundary $\partial\Omega$, then we set

$$T_{a_1} = \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{rp}}(B_3), \text{ where } B_2 = (b_1, b_2, b_3)$$

and verify that T_{a_1} belongs to $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{hread}}(a, G, \partial\Omega)$. Otherwise, we proceed as before, with b_2 replaced by b_3. At the j-th step, we have constructed a set of *distinct* ordered points $B_j = (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_j)$ in $V(G)$. We stop if $b_j \in \partial\Omega$, setting $T_{a_1} = \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{rp}}(B_j)$. If not, we procedd as before. Since the total number of points in Ω is finite, the process stops in at most $\sharp(V(G) \cap \Omega)$ steps and one may check that condition (A.5) is fulfilled.

Step 2: iterating the construction. We next define $A_1 = A \setminus \{a_1\} = \{a_2, \ldots, a_p\}$. We remove the thread $T_{a_1} \Subset G$ from the graph setting $G_1 = G \smallsetminus T_{a_1} \in \mathcal{G}(A_1, \partial\Omega)$. Arguing as before with a_1 replaced by A_2 we construct a thread $T_{a_2} \Subset G_1$, so that we may define $G_2 = G_1 \smallsetminus T_{a_2}$ and hence $G = T_{a_1} \curlyvee T_{a_2} \curlyvee G_2$ with $G_2 \in \mathcal{G}(\{a_3, \ldots, a_p\}, \partial\Omega)$. Proceeding similarily for p steps, we obtain the desired decomposition. □

A.2 The functional and minimal branched connections to the boundary

Given a directed graph G, we consider the functional defined on $\mathcal{G}(A, \partial\Omega)$

$$\mathrm{W}_\alpha(G) = \sum_{e \in E(G)} (d(e))^\alpha \mathcal{H}^1(e) \text{ for } G \in \mathcal{G}(A, \partial\Omega). \tag{A.11}$$

and then the non-negative quantity

$$\mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\mathrm{brbd}}(A, \partial\Omega) = \inf\{\mathrm{W}_\alpha(G), G \in \mathcal{G}(A, \partial\Omega)\}, \tag{A.12}$$

which we will term the branched connection of order α of the set A to the boundary $\partial\Omega$. Notice that the case $\alpha = 1$ has already been introduced in [12] as minimal connection to the boundary. Using simple comparison arguments, one may easily prove that if A and B are disjoint finite subsets of Ω then

$$\mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\mathrm{brbd}}(A \cup B, \partial\Omega) \leq \mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\mathrm{brbd}}(A, \partial\Omega) + \mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\mathrm{brbd}}(B, \partial\Omega) \tag{A.13}$$

and if $0 < \alpha' \leq \alpha$ on $\Omega \subset \Omega'$ then we have

$$\mathfrak{L}^{\alpha}_{\mathrm{brbd}}(A, \partial\Omega) \leq \mathcal{L}^{\alpha'}_{\mathrm{branch}}(A, \partial\Omega) \text{ and } \mathfrak{L}^{\alpha}_{\mathrm{brbd}}(A, \partial\Omega) \leq \mathfrak{L}^{\alpha}_{\mathrm{brbd}}(A, \partial\Omega'). \tag{A.14}$$

Moreover it can be proved:

Lemma A.1 ([28])**.** *The infimum in* (A.12) *is achieved by some graph* $G^{\alpha}_{\mathrm{opt}} \in \mathcal{G}(A, \partial\Omega)$*. Moreover* $G^{\alpha}_{\mathrm{opt}}$ *has no loops and we may therefore write*

$$G^{\alpha}_{\mathrm{opt}} = \curlyvee_{a \in A} T_a \text{ with } T_a \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{hread}}(a, G, \partial\Omega). \tag{A.15}$$

Moreover, we have $d(e) \leq \sharp(A)$ *for any* $e \in E(G^{\alpha}_{\mathrm{opt}})$*.*

In the next subsection, we will be mainly concerned with the asymptotic behavior of $\mathfrak{L}^{\alpha}_{\mathrm{brbd}}(A, \partial\Omega)$ as the number of elements in A tends to $+\infty$, specially in the case they are equi-distributed. Our methods rely n various decomposition, as presented next.

A.3 Decomposing the domain and the graphs

We discuss here some issues related to partitions of the domain Ω. We consider the case where the set Ω is decomposed as a finite union

$$\bar{\Omega} = \bigcup_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{P}} \bar{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{p}}, \text{ where the sets } \Omega_{\mathfrak{p}} \text{ are disjoint i.e. } \Omega_{\mathfrak{p}} \cap \Omega'_{\mathfrak{p}} = \emptyset \text{ for } \mathfrak{p} \neq \mathfrak{p}'. \tag{A.16}$$

Let A be a finite subset of Ω which does not intersect the boundaries $\partial\Omega_{\mathfrak{p}}$. For $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{P}$ we set $A_{\mathfrak{p}} = \bar{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{p}} \cap A$. We have the lower bound

$$\mathfrak{L}^{\alpha}_{\mathrm{brbd}}(A, \partial\Omega) \geq \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{P}} \mathfrak{L}^{\alpha}_{\mathrm{brbd}}(A_{\mathfrak{p}}, \partial\Omega_{\mathfrak{p}}). \tag{A.17}$$

Indeed, if G is a graph in $\mathcal{G}(A, \partial\Omega)$, then the restriction $G_{\mathfrak{p}}$ to the subset $\Omega_{\mathfrak{p}}$ belongs to $\mathcal{G}(A_{\mathfrak{p}}, \partial\Omega_{\mathfrak{p}})$. On the other hand, we have

$$\mathrm{W}_{\alpha}(G) = \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{P}} \mathrm{W}_{\alpha}(G_{\mathfrak{p}}),$$

from which the conclusion (A.17) is deduced. The next result, is an improvement of (A.17). Consider a number $0 < \mu_1 \leq 1$ such that

$$\sharp(A_1) \geq \mu_1 \sharp(A). \tag{A.18}$$

Proposition A.2. *Assume that* $\mathfrak{P} = \{1, 2\}$*. Then, we have the lower bound*

$$\mathfrak{L}^{\alpha}_{\mathrm{brbd}}(A, \partial\Omega) \geq \sum_{\mathfrak{p}=1}^{2} \mathfrak{L}^{\alpha}_{\mathrm{brbd}}(A_{\mathfrak{p}}, \partial\Omega_{\mathfrak{p}}) + \kappa_1 \mu_1 (\mathrm{N_{el}})^{\alpha} \mathrm{dist}\,(\Omega_1, \partial\Omega), \tag{A.19}$$

where $\kappa_{\alpha} > 0$ *is some constant depending only on* α *and where* $\mathrm{N_{el}} = \sharp(A)$ *denotes the number of elements in* A*.*

Notice that the previous result is only of interest in the case dist $(\Omega_1, \partial\Omega) \neq 0$, that is when $\bar{\Omega}_1 \subset \Omega$. The proof involves concavity properties, in particular the next result.

Lemma A.2. *Let $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, $d_1 \geq 1$ and $d_2 \geq 1$ be given. There exists some universal constant $\kappa_1 > 0$ depending only on α such that*

$$(d_1 + d_2)^\alpha \geq d_1^\alpha + \kappa_1 \inf\{d_2^\alpha,\, d_2\, d_1^{\alpha-1}\}.$$

Proof of Lemma A.2. We distinguish three cases.

Case 1: $d_2 \leq \frac{1}{2} d_1$. We rely on the Taylor expansion of the expression $(1+s)^\alpha$ for s in $(0,1]$ which leads to the concavity estimate

$$(1+s)^\alpha \geq 1 + \alpha s - \frac{1}{2}\alpha(\alpha-1)s^2 = 1 + \frac{1}{2}\alpha s(1-(\alpha-1)s) \geq 1 + \frac{1}{2}\alpha s(1-s). \tag{A.20}$$

We apply (A.20) with $s = \dfrac{d_2}{d_1} \leq \dfrac{1}{2}$, leading to the inequality

$$(d_1 + d_2)^\alpha \geq d_1^\alpha + \frac{1}{4}\,\alpha d_2\, d_1^{\alpha-1}. \tag{A.21}$$

Case 2: $8d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \frac{1}{2} d_1$. In this case, we obtain invoking (A.20) once more

$$(d_1 + d_2)^\alpha \geq (\frac{3}{2} d_1)^\alpha \geq (1 + \frac{1}{8}\alpha) d_1^\alpha \geq d_1^\alpha + \frac{1}{8}\alpha \left(\frac{d_2}{8}\right)^\alpha \geq d_1^\alpha + \alpha \left(\frac{1}{8}\right)^{\alpha+1} d_2^\alpha. \tag{A.22}$$

Case 3: $8d_1 \leq d_2$. In this case we write

$$(d_1 + d_2)^\alpha \geq d_2^\alpha \geq \frac{1}{8^\alpha} d_2^\alpha + (1 - \frac{1}{8^\alpha}) d_2^\alpha \geq d_1^\alpha + (1 - \frac{1}{8^\alpha}) d_2^\alpha. \tag{A.23}$$

We set $\kappa_1 = \inf\{\frac{1}{4}\alpha, \alpha\left(\frac{1}{8}\right)^{\alpha+1}, \left(1 - \frac{1}{8^\alpha}\right)\}$. Combining (A.21), (A.22) and (A.23) in the three cases, we complete the proof of the lemma. □

We will use Lemma A.2 in the case we assume moreover that we have the additional assumption

$$d_1 + d_2 \leq \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{ber}}, \tag{A.24}$$

where $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{ber}} \gg 1$ is some large number. It follows from (A.24) that $d_2^\alpha \geq d_2 (\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{ber}})^{\alpha-1}$ and $d_1^{\alpha-1} \geq (\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{ber}})^{\alpha-1}$ so that in this case, (A.21) leads to the inequality

$$(d_1 + d_2)^\alpha \geq d_1^\alpha + \kappa_1\, d_2 (\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{ber}})^{\alpha-1}, \tag{A.25}$$

and hence the right hand side of (A.25) behaves linearily with respect to d_2. This observation will be important in our argument.

Proof of Proposition A.2 completed. As already mentioned, we may assume that $\bar{\Omega}_1 \subset \Omega$, since otherwise the result (A.19) is a immediate consequence of (A.17). In this situation we have $\Omega_2 = \Omega \setminus \bar{\Omega}_1$. Let $G^\alpha_{\rm opt}$ be an optimal graph for $\mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\rm brbd}(A, \partial\Omega)$. In view of Lemma A.1 we may decompose $G^\alpha_{\rm opt}$ as in (A.15), so that we may write $G^\alpha_{\rm opt} = G_1 \curlyvee G_2$ with for $\mathfrak{p} = 1, 2$

$$G_{\mathfrak{p}} = \underset{a\in A_i}{\curlyvee} T_a, \text{ where the threads } T_a \in \mathcal{T}_{\rm hread}(a, G^\alpha_{\rm opt}, \partial\Omega) \text{ satisfy (A.5).}$$

We proceed next to a *spatial decomposition* of this sets, introducing the subgraphs

$$G_{\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{q}} = G_{\mathfrak{p}} \llcorner \Omega_{\mathfrak{q}} \in \mathcal{G}(A_{\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{q}}, \partial\Omega_{\mathfrak{q}}) \text{ where } A_{\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{q}} = \emptyset \text{ if } \mathfrak{p} \neq \mathfrak{q} \text{ and } A_{\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{p}} = A_{\mathfrak{p}} \text{ otherwise.}$$

We pay special attention to the subgraph $G_{1,2}$. Given a thread T_a with $a \in A_1$, combining the directed segments of this thread,we obtain a curve $\mathcal{C}_a$ which we may parametrize by arc-length curve $f_a : I \to \mathbb{R}^m, s \mapsto f_a(s)$, where I is an interval of the form $I = [0, s_{\max}(a)]$, such that $|f_a'| = 1$, $f_a(0) = 0$ and $f_a(s_{\max}(a)) \in \partial\Omega$. There exists therefore a value $s_1(a) < s_{\max}(a)$ of the parameter such that $f_a(s) \in \Omega_2$, for any $s \in s_{\max}(a) - s_1(a))$. We notice also at this stage that

$$s_{\max}(a) - s_1(a) \geq \mathfrak{s}_{\rm inter} \equiv {\rm dist}(\Omega_1, \partial\Omega). \tag{A.26}$$

We decompose the thread T_a into two subthreads $T_a = T_a^{\rm in} \curlyvee T_a^{\rm out}$, $T_a^{\rm in}$ being the directed graph related to the inner part of the curve namely the curve $\mathcal{C}_a^{\rm in} = \{f_a(s), s \in [0, s_1(a)]$ whereas $T_a^{\rm out}$ corresponds to the curve $\mathcal{C}_a^{\rm out} = \{f_a(s), s \in s_{\max}(a) - s_1(a)\}$. We finally introduce the graphs

$$G^{\rm out}_{1,2} = \underset{a\in A_1}{\curlyvee} T_a^{\rm out} \text{ and } G^{\rm in}_{1,2} = \underset{a\in A_1}{\curlyvee} T_a^{\rm in} \llcorner \Omega_2$$

and write

$$G^\alpha_{\rm opt} = \tilde{G}_1 \curlyvee \tilde{G}_2 \curlyvee \tilde{G}_{1,2} \text{ with } \tilde{G}_1 \equiv G_{1,1} \curlyvee G_{2,1}, \ \tilde{G}_2 \equiv G_{2,2} \curlyvee G^{\rm in}_{1,2} \text{ and } \tilde{G}_{1,2} \equiv G^{\rm out}_{1,2}.$$

We verify that $\tilde{G}_1 \in \mathcal{G}(A_1, \partial\Omega_1)$, $\tilde{G}_2 \in \mathcal{G}(A_2, \partial\Omega_2)$, $\tilde{G}_{1,2} \in \mathcal{G}(\emptyset, \partial\Omega_2)$, so that $\tilde{G}_2 \curlyvee \tilde{G}_{1,2} \in \mathcal{G}(A_2, \partial\Omega_2)$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\rm brbd}(A, \partial\Omega) =& W_\alpha(G^\alpha_{\rm opt}) = W_\alpha(\tilde{G}_1) + W_\alpha(\tilde{G}_2 \curlyvee \tilde{G}_{1,2}) \\ &\geq \mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\rm brbd}(A_1, \partial\Omega_1) + W_\alpha(\tilde{G}_2 \curlyvee \tilde{G}_{1,2}). \end{aligned} \tag{A.27}$$

We finally claim that, for some universal constant $\kappa_1 > 0$, we have

$$W_\alpha(\tilde{G}_2 \curlyvee \tilde{G}_{1,2}) \geq W_\alpha(\tilde{G}_2) + \kappa_0 \mu_1(\sharp(A))^\alpha {\rm dist}\,(\Omega_1, \partial\Omega). \tag{A.28}$$

Proof of the claim (A.28). Given a segment e of the graph $\tilde{G}_2 \curlyvee \tilde{G}_{1,2}$, we denote by $\tilde{d}_2(e)$ (resp. $\tilde{d}_{1,2}(e)$) its multiplicity according to the graph $\tilde{G}_2$ (resp $\tilde{G}_{1,2}$), with the convention that $\tilde{d}_2(e) = 0$ (resp. $\tilde{d}_{1,2}(e) = 0$) if the segment does not belong to $E(\tilde{G}_{1,2})$ (resp. $E(\tilde{G}_{1,2})$. It follows from the last statement in Lemma A.1 that

$$\tilde{d}_2(e) + \tilde{d}_{1,2}(e) \leq {\rm N_{el}}, \tag{A.29}$$

and the definition of W_α leads to the identity

$$W_\alpha(\tilde{G}_2 \curlyvee \tilde{G}_{1,2}) = \sum_{e\in E(\tilde{G}_2 \curlyvee \tilde{G}_{1,2})} \Big(\tilde{d}_2(e) + \tilde{d}_{1,2}(e)\Big)^\alpha \mathcal{H}^1(e).$$

We invoke next inequality (A.25) with $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{ber}} = \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{el}}$, $d_1 = \tilde{d}_2(e)$ and $d_2 = \tilde{d}_{1,2}(e)$. Since (A.29) yields (A.24) in the case considered, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} W_\alpha(\tilde{G}_2 \curlyvee \tilde{G}_{1,2}) &\geq \sum_{e\in E(\tilde{G}_2\curlyvee\tilde{G}_{1,2})} \left(\tilde{d}_2(e)^\alpha + \kappa_1 \tilde{d}_{1,2}(e)\,(\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{el}})^{\alpha-1}\right)\mathcal{H}^1(e) \\ &\geq \sum_{e\in E(\tilde{G}_2)} \tilde{d}_2(e)^\alpha \mathcal{H}^1(e) + \kappa_1\ (\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{el}})^{\alpha-1} \sum_{e\in\tilde{E}(G_{1,2})} \tilde{d}_{1,2}(e)\mathcal{H}^1(e). \end{aligned} \tag{A.30}$$

We notice that, by definition, we have $W_\alpha(\tilde{G}_2) = \sum_{e\in E(\tilde{G}_2)} \tilde{d}_2(e)^\alpha \mathcal{H}^1(e)$, whereas

$$\sum_{e\in\tilde{E}(G_{1,2})} \tilde{d}_{1,2}(e)\mathcal{H}^1(e) = \sum_{a\in A_1} \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{C}_a^{\mathrm{out}}) \geq \sharp(A_1)\mathrm{dist}(\Omega_1, \partial\Omega), \tag{A.31}$$

where for the last inequality, we invoke the fact that each the curves $\mathcal{C}_a^{\mathrm{out}}$ for $a \in A_1$ joins Ω_1 to the boundary $\partial\Omega$. Combining (A.30), (A.31), assumption (A.18) and the definition of $W_\alpha(\tilde{G}_2)$ we derive the desired inequality (A.28) and complete the proof of the claim.

Finally, to complete the proof of Proposition A.2, it suffices to notice that

$$W_\alpha(\tilde{G}_2) \geq \mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\mathrm{brbd}}(A_2, \partial\Omega_2),$$

which combined with (A.27) and (A.28) yields inequality (A.19). □

A.4 Estimates for minimal branched connections

An important observation made[9] in Xia is:

Proposition A.3. *Assume that $\alpha \in (\alpha_m, 1]$, where $\alpha_m = 1 - \frac{1}{m}$. Then we have*

$$\mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\mathrm{brbd}}(A, \partial\Omega) \leq C(\Omega, \alpha)\,(\sharp(A))^\alpha\,, \tag{A.32}$$

where the constant $C(\Omega, \alpha)$ depends only on Ω and α.

The proof is obvious in the case $\alpha = 1$. Indeed in this case, one may obtain an upper bound for $\mathcal{L}^1_{\mathrm{branch}}(A, \partial\Omega)$ estimating $W_1(G_0)$ where G_0 is constructed as in subsection A.1 connecting each point in A to its nearest point on the boundary. We obtain

$$W_1(G_0) \leq \mathrm{diam}(\Omega)\,(\sharp(A))\,,$$

yielding the result in the case considered. In the general case $\alpha_m \leq \alpha < 1$, estimate (A.32) yields an improvement on the growth in terms of $\sharp A$. This is achieved in [28] replacing the elementary comparison graph G_0 by graphs having several branching obtained through a dyadic decomposition.

[9]Here we refer to Proposition 3.1 in [28]. Although the statement there is slightly different from ours, the reader may easily adapt the proof.

A.5 The case of a uniform grid

We next focus on behavior of $\mathfrak{L}^{\alpha}_{\mathrm{brbd}}$ in the special Ω is the m-dimensional unit cube that is $\Omega = [0,1]^m$and the points of A are located on an uniform grid. We consider therefore for an integer k in $\mathbb{N}^*$ the distance $h = \frac{1}{\mathrm{k}}$ and the set of points

$$A^{\mathrm{k}}_m \equiv \boxplus^{\mathrm{k}}_m(h) = \left\{ a^k_{\mathrm{I}} \equiv h\, I = h\,(i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_m),\ \text{for } I \in \{1, \ldots, \mathrm{k}\}^m \right\},$$

so that the $\sharp(A^{\mathrm{k}}_m) = \mathrm{k}^m$. We set

$$\Lambda^{\alpha}_m(\mathrm{k}) = \mathfrak{L}^{\alpha}_{\mathrm{brbd}}(A^{\mathrm{k}}_m, \partial(0,1)^m) \text{ and } \Xi^{\alpha}_m(\mathrm{k}) \equiv \mathrm{k}^{-m\alpha}\Lambda^{\alpha}_m(\mathrm{k})$$

and are interested in the asymptotic behavior of the quantities $\Lambda^{\alpha}_m(\mathrm{k})$ and $\Xi^{\alpha}_m(\mathrm{k})$ as $\mathrm{k} \to +\infty$. We observe first that if follows from Proposition A.3 that if $\alpha < \alpha_m$ then, we have the upper bound

$$\Lambda^{\alpha}_m(\mathrm{k}) \leq C_\alpha \mathrm{k}^{m\alpha} \ \text{ i.e. } \ \Xi^{\alpha}_m(\mathrm{k}) \leq C_\alpha, \tag{A.33}$$

where the constant $C_\alpha > 0$ does not depend on k. In the critical case $\alpha = \alpha_m$, the upper bound (A.33) no longer holds as our next result shows.

Theorem A.1. *There exists some constant* $\mathrm{C}_m > 0$ *such that for all* $\mathrm{k} \in \mathbb{N}^*$*, we have the lower bound*

$$\Lambda^{\alpha_m}_m(\mathrm{k}) \geq \mathrm{C}_m \mathrm{k}^{m\alpha_m} \log \mathrm{k} = \mathrm{C}_m \mathrm{k}^{m-1} \log \mathrm{k},$$

that is

$$\Xi^{\alpha_m}_m(\mathrm{k}) \geq \mathrm{C}_m \log \mathrm{k}.$$

Remark A.1. The fact that the quantity $\Xi^{\alpha_m}_m(\mathrm{k}) = \mathrm{k}^{1-m}\Lambda^{\alpha_m}_m(\mathrm{k})$ does not remain bounded as $\mathrm{k} \to +\infty$ is related and may also presumably be deduced from the fact that the Lebesgue measure *is not irrigible* for the critical value $\alpha = \alpha_m$, a result which has been proved in [13] (see also [4]).

The proof of Theorem A.1 will rely on several preliminary results we present first.

Lemma A.3. *Let* $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathbb{N}^*$ *be given. there exists some constant* $\mathrm{C}^{\alpha}_{\mathfrak{q}} > 0$ *such that*

$$\Xi^{\alpha}_m(\mathfrak{q}\,\mathrm{k}) \geq \mathfrak{q}^{m(1-\alpha)-1}\,\Xi^{\alpha}_m(\mathrm{k}) + \mathrm{C}^{\alpha}_{\mathfrak{q}}, \quad \text{for any } \mathrm{k} \in \mathbb{N}^*.$$

Proof. The Lemma is a consequence of Proposition A.2 combined with appropriate scaling laws. We decompose first the domain $[0,1]^m$ as an union of cubes $\mathrm{Q}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ with $\mathfrak{p} \equiv (j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_m) \in \mathfrak{P} = \{0, \ldots, \mathfrak{q}-1\}^m$ and

$$\mathrm{Q}_{\mathfrak{p}} = \frac{1}{\mathfrak{q}}(j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_m) + (0, \frac{1}{\mathfrak{q}})^m,$$

so that $\mathrm{Q}_{\mathfrak{p}} \cap \mathrm{Q}_{\mathfrak{p}'} \neq \emptyset$ if $\mathfrak{p} \neq \mathfrak{p}'$ and $[0,1]^m = \bigcup_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{P}} \bar{\mathrm{Q}}_{\mathfrak{p}}$. We set

$$A^{\mathfrak{q}}_{\mathfrak{p}} \equiv A^{\mathfrak{q}\mathrm{k}}_m \cap \mathrm{Q}_{\mathfrak{p}}, \text{ so that } A_{\mathfrak{p}} = \frac{1}{\mathfrak{q}}\mathfrak{p} + \frac{1}{\mathfrak{q}}A^k_m.$$

By scaling and translation, we deduce that

$$\mathfrak{L}^{\alpha}_{\mathrm{brbd}}(A_{\mathfrak{p}}, \partial \mathrm{Q}_{\mathfrak{p}}) = \mathfrak{q}^{-1}\Lambda^{\alpha}_m(\mathrm{k}). \tag{A.34}$$

We consider the integer $j_0 \equiv \left[\frac{j}{2}\right]$, the multi-index $\mathfrak{p}_0 = (j_0, j_0, \ldots, j_0)$ and the sets $\Omega_1^{\mathfrak{q}} = \mathrm{Q}_{\mathfrak{p}_0}$ and $\Omega_2^{\mathfrak{q}} = \bigcup_{\mathfrak{p}\in\mathfrak{P}\setminus\mathfrak{p}_0} \mathrm{Q}_{\mathfrak{p}}$, so that $\mathrm{dist}(\Omega_1^{\mathfrak{q}}, \partial(0,1)^m) \geq \frac{1}{4}$ for $\mathfrak{q} \geq 4$,

$$\sharp(\Omega_1 \cap A_m^{\mathfrak{q}\mathrm{k}}) = \mathrm{k}^m \text{and } \sharp(\Omega_2 \cap A_m^{\mathfrak{q}\mathrm{k}}) = (\mathfrak{q}^m - 1)\mathrm{k}^m.$$

Applying inequality (A.19) of Proposition A.32, we are led to

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_m^\alpha(\mathfrak{q}\mathrm{k}) = \mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\mathrm{brbd}}(A_m^{\mathfrak{q}\mathrm{k}}, \partial(0,1)^m) \geq & \mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\mathrm{brbd}}(A_{\mathfrak{p}_0}, \partial \mathrm{Q}_{\mathfrak{p}_0}) + \mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\mathrm{brbd}}(\Omega_2 \cap A_m^{\mathfrak{q}\mathrm{k}}, \partial(0,1)^m) \\ & + \kappa_\alpha \frac{1}{4}\mathrm{k}^{m\alpha}\mathfrak{q}^{m(\alpha-1)}.\end{aligned} \tag{A.35}$$

On the other hand, we deduce from inequality (A.17) and (A.34) that

$$\mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\mathrm{brbd}}(\Omega_2 \cap A_m^{\mathfrak{q}\mathrm{k}}, \partial(0,1)^m) \geq \sum_{\mathfrak{p}\in\mathfrak{P}\setminus\mathfrak{p}_0} \mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\mathrm{brbd}}(A_{\mathfrak{p}}, \partial \mathrm{Q}_{\mathfrak{p}}) = [\mathfrak{q}^m - 1]\,\mathfrak{q}^{-1}\Lambda_m^\alpha(\mathrm{k}) \tag{A.36}$$

Combining (A.35), (A.36) and (A.34), we are led to

$$\Lambda_m^\alpha(\mathfrak{q}\mathrm{k}) \geq \mathfrak{q}^{m-1}\Lambda_m^\alpha(\mathrm{k}) + \frac{1}{4}\kappa_\alpha \mathrm{k}^{m\alpha}\mathfrak{q}^{m(\alpha-1)} \tag{A.37}$$

Multiplying both sides of this inequality by $(\mathfrak{q}\mathrm{k})^{-m\alpha}$, we obtain the desired result with $\mathrm{C}_{\mathfrak{q}}^\alpha = \frac{1}{4}\kappa_\alpha q^{-1}$. □

Lemma A.4. *We have for any integer* $1 \leq \mathrm{k}' \leq \mathrm{k}$

$$\Lambda_m^\alpha(\mathrm{k}') \leq \frac{\mathrm{k}}{\mathrm{k}'}\Lambda_m^\alpha(\mathrm{k}) \quad \text{and hence} \quad \Xi_m^\alpha(\mathrm{k}') \leq \left(\frac{\mathrm{k}}{\mathrm{k}'}\right)^{m\alpha+1} \Xi_m^\alpha(\mathrm{k})$$

Proof. consider the cube $\mathcal{Q}'_{\mathrm{k}} = (0, \frac{\mathrm{k}'}{\mathrm{k}})^m \subset (0,1)^m$ and the $A' = A_m^{\mathrm{k}} \cap \mathcal{Q}'_{\mathrm{k}}$. It follows from inequality (A.17) that

$$\mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\mathrm{brbd}}(A', \partial\mathcal{Q}'_{\mathrm{k}}) \leq \mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\mathrm{brbd}}(A_m^{\mathrm{k}}, \partial(0,1)^m) = \Lambda_m^\alpha(\mathrm{k}),$$

whereas the scaling property yields

$$\mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\mathrm{brbd}}(A', \partial\mathcal{Q}'_{\mathrm{k}}) = \frac{\mathrm{k}}{\mathrm{k}'}\Lambda_m^\alpha(\mathrm{k}').$$

The conclusion follows combining the previous inequalities. □

Proof of Theorem A.1 completed. Iterating the inequality of Lemma A.3 in the special case $\alpha = \alpha_m$ for which the exponent $m(1-\alpha_m) - 1$ vanishes, we are led, for any integer $\mathfrak{q} \geq 4$ and any integer $\ell > 0$, to the lower bound

$$\Xi_m^\alpha(\mathfrak{q}^\ell) \geq \mathrm{C}_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\alpha_m}\ell. \tag{A.38}$$

On the other hand, it follows from Lemma A.4 that for any $\mathfrak{q}^\ell \leq \mathrm{k} \leq \mathfrak{q}^{\ell+1}$ we have

$$\Xi_m^{\alpha_m}(\mathrm{k}) \geq \mathfrak{q}^{-m}\ \Xi_m^\alpha(\mathfrak{q}^\ell) \tag{A.39}$$

so that, combining with (A.38) we deduce that, for any $\mathrm{k} \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we obtain the inequality

$$\Xi_m^{\alpha_m}(\mathrm{k}) \geq \mathfrak{q}^{-m}\mathrm{C}_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\alpha_m}\left[\frac{\log \mathrm{k}}{\log \mathfrak{q}}\right],$$

which leads immediately to the conclusion. □

Remark A.2. For super critical exponents, that is for $\alpha > \alpha_m$ the same type of argument show that

$$\Xi_m^\alpha(\mathrm{k}) \to +\infty \text{ as } \mathrm{k} \to +\infty,$$

and that we even have, for any $\beta > \alpha_m$

$$\mathrm{k}^{-m\beta}\Lambda_m^\alpha(\mathrm{k}) \to +\infty \text{ as } \mathrm{k} \to +\infty,$$

In a work in progress [9], we will actually show that $\mathrm{k}^{-m\alpha_m}\Lambda_m^\alpha(\mathrm{k})$ is a bounded function for $\alpha > \alpha_m$.

A.6 Relating $\mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\mathrm{brbd}}$ and $\mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\mathrm{branch}}$

We introduce here the possibility of having points with negative charges, and consider as in the introduction a collection of points $(P_i)_{i\in J^+}$ in Ω with positive charge $+1$, a collection of points $(Q_j)_{j\in J^-}$ in Ω, with negative charge -1. We define the set $\mathcal{G}(P_i, Q_i, \Omega)$ of graph satisfying

$$\left(\underset{i\in J^+}{\cup}\{P_i\}\right) \cup \left(\underset{j\in J^-}{\cup}\{Q_j\}\right) \subset V(G) \subset \bar{\Omega}.$$

and which, instead of (A.4), its modified version including the possibility of having negative charges, namely the

$$\sum_{e\in E(G), e^-=a} \mathrm{H}(e) = \underset{\substack{e\in E(G)\\ e^+=a}}{\mathrm{H}}(e) + \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if} & a \in \{P_i\}_{i\in J} \\ -1 \text{ if} & a \in \{Q_i\}_{i\in J} \\ 0 \text{ otherwise} & \end{cases} \tag{A.40}$$

For $0 \le \alpha \le 1$ we set

$$\mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\mathrm{brbd}}(P_i, Q_i, \partial\Omega) = \inf\left\{\mathrm{W}_\alpha(G), G \in \mathcal{G}\left(\{P_i\}_{i\in J^+}, \{Q_j\}_{j\in J^-}, \Omega\right)\right\}, \tag{A.41}$$

where the functional $\mathrm{W}_\alpha(G)$ is the weighted length of the graph connection defined by

$$\mathrm{W}_\alpha(G) = \sum_{e\in E(G)} (d(e))^\alpha \mathcal{H}^1(e) \text{ for } G \in \mathcal{G}\left(\{P_i\}_{i\in J}, \{Q_i\}_{i\in J}, \Omega\right).$$

Next assume that we are given a family $(\Omega_{\mathfrak{p}})_{\mathfrak{p}\in\mathfrak{P}}$ of disjoint domains in $\mathbb{R}^m$, that is satisfying $\Omega_{\mathfrak{p}} \cap \Omega_{\mathfrak{p}'} = \emptyset$ if $\mathfrak{p} \neq \mathfrak{p}'$. We assume moreover that

$$\underset{i\in J}{\cup}\{Q_i\} \cap \Omega_{\mathfrak{p}} = \emptyset \text{ and set } \mathfrak{A}_{\mathfrak{p}} = \{P_i\}_{i\in J} \cap \Omega_{\mathfrak{p}}. \tag{A.42}$$

Lemma A.5. *If* (A.42) *is satisfied, then we have the inequality*

$$\mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\mathrm{brbd}}\left(P_i, Q_j, \Omega\right) \ge \sum_{\mathfrak{p}\in\mathfrak{P}} \mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\mathrm{brbd}}(\mathfrak{A}_{\mathfrak{p}}, \partial\Omega_{\mathfrak{p}}).$$

Proof. Let G be a graph in $\mathcal{G}\left(\{P_i\}_{i\in J}, \{Q_i\}_{i\in J}, \Omega\right)$ and set $G_{\mathfrak{p}} = G \cap \Omega_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Since there are no negative charges in $\Omega_{\mathfrak{p}}$, It turns out that $G_{\mathfrak{p}} \in \mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{A}_{\mathfrak{p}}, \partial\Omega_{\mathfrak{p}})$, so that

$$\mathrm{W}_\alpha(G_{\mathfrak{p}}) \ge \mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\mathrm{brbd}}(\mathfrak{A}_{\mathfrak{p}}, \partial\Omega_{\mathfrak{p}}).$$

On the other hand, we have $\mathrm{W}_\alpha(G) \ge \sum_{\mathfrak{p}\in\mathfrak{P}} \mathrm{W}_\alpha(G_{\mathfrak{p}})$ so that the conclusion follows. □

Notice that, in the case $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^m$, then $\mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\rm brbd}\,(P_i, Q_i, \mathbb{R}^m) = +\infty$, except in the case $\sharp(J^+) = \sharp(J^-)$, i.e. there are the same number of $+1$ charges as -1 charges. In that case, we may choose $J^+ = J^- \equiv J$ and set

$$\mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\rm branch}\,(\ P_i, Q_i) = \mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\rm brbd}\,(P_i, Q_j, \mathbb{R}^m)$$

which is in the case $m = 4$ and $\alpha = \frac{3}{4} = \alpha_4$, is related functional $\mathrm{L}_{\rm branch}$ presented in the Introduction.

A.7 Additional comments and open questions

Whereas important progresses have been accomplished in the subcritical case $1 \geq \alpha > \alpha_m$ (see e.g [4] and the references therein), for which an impressive framework has been worked out, it seems that the critical case $\alpha = \alpha_m$, which is of interest in the present paper as well as the supercritical case $0 \leq \alpha < \alpha_m$ do not completely fit into this framework and address several new issues which presumably require some new thoughts.

An important achievements Xia's paper [28] is that, in the subcritical case $1 > \alpha > \alpha_m$, one may renormalize the functional $\mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\rm branch}$ defined as above on discrete set of points (or in setting of [28] atomic measures) so that the renormalization yields a functional defined on general bounded measures, somehow in the same spirit as the convergence (37) of atomic measures to diffuse measures. In crude terms, this renormalization amounts essential to divide the functional $\mathfrak{L}^\alpha_{\rm branch}$ by the term $\sharp(A)^\alpha$, A standing for the set of points. An essential ingredient is provided by variants of formulas similar or related to (A.32), allowing to define distances on the set of measures. In the critical case, this renormlization fails in view for instance of Theorem (A.1) or the non-irigability results in [13]. Therefore, if a renormalization process exists, it has to follow *new patterns*.

As a possible direction of further investigations, the *spectrum of lenghts* raises natural questions, possibly also in view of other applications. For sake of simplicity, we may start with the case of a uniform grid as considered in subsection A.5, and consider for given $\mathrm{k} \in \mathbb{N}$ on optimal graph G_k for $\Lambda_m(\mathrm{k})$. Let $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ be given and consider the set

$$V_j(G_\mathrm{k}) = \{e \in V(G_\mathrm{k}) \text{ such that } 2^{-(j+1)m}k^m \leq d(e) \leq 2^{-jm}k^m, \}$$

and the total lenght of the segments e in $V_j(G_\mathrm{k})$ given by

$$\xi_\mathrm{k}(j) = \sum_{e \in V_j(G_\mathrm{k})} \mathcal{H}^1(e).$$

The mapping $j \to \xi_\mathrm{k}(j)$ then yields a spectrum of length according to the density of the segments. Theorem A.1 show that

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{-j(m-1)} \mathrm{k}^{m-1} \xi_\mathrm{k}(j) \leq C \log \mathrm{k}.$$

It suggest the following question: Does there exist, for any $j \in Z$ a constant $C > 0$ independant of k such that

$$\mathrm{k}^{m-1}\xi_\mathrm{k}(j) \leq C\, 2^{j(m-1)} \text{ for any } i \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and for any } \mathrm{k} \in \mathbb{N}?$$

This question make also sense in the supercritical case. Another object which seems rather natural in the search of a renormalization process is given by the graph

$$W_j^{\mathrm{k}} = \bigcup_{q \geq j} V_q(G_{\mathrm{k}}),$$

and its possible convergence to a limiting set as first $\mathrm{k} \to +\infty$, and then $j \to +\infty$. Deeply related to these issues, questions around the self-similarity properties of optimal graphs will property appear, a first step behind presumably to find the appropriate formulations.

References

[1] F.Almgreen, F.Browder and E.Lieb *Co-area, liquid crystals, and minimal surfaces*, in Partial differential equations (Tianjin, 1986), Springer (1988), 1–22.

[2] G.Alberti, S.Baldo and G.Orlandi *Variational convergence for functionals of Ginzburg-Landau type* Indiana Univ. Math. J. **54** (2005), 1411–1472.

[3] D.Auckly and L. Kapitanski, *The Pontrjagin-Hopf invariants for Sobolev maps*, Commun. Contemp. Math **12** (2010), 121–181.

[4] M.Bernot, V.Caselles, and J.M.Morel, *Optimal transportation networks. Models and theory.* Springer (2009). 200 p.

[5] F. Bethuel, *A characterization of maps in $H^1(\mathbb{B}^3, \mathbb{S}^2)$ which can be approximated by smooth maps*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **7** (1990), 269–286.

[6] F. Bethuel, *The approximation problem for Sobolev maps between two manifolds*, Acta Math. **167** (1991), 153–206.

[7] F. Bethuel, H. Brezis and J.M. Coron, *Relaxed energies for harmonic maps*, *in* Variational methods (Paris, 1988), Springer (1990), 37–52.

[8] F.Bethuel and D. Chiron, *Some questions related to the lifting problem in Sobolev spaces*, *in* Perspectives in nonlinear partial differential equations, Contemp. Math., **446** (2007), 125–152.

[9] F. Bethuel and G. Canevari, *Branched transportation for the critical and super-critical exponents*, work in progress.

[10] F. Bethuel, J.M. Coron, F.Demengel and F. Hélein, *A cohomological criterion for density of smooth maps in Sobolev spaces between two manifolds*, *in* Nematics (Orsay, 1990), Kluwer Acad. (1991) 15–23.

[11] F. Bethuel and X. Zheng, *Density of smooth functions between two manifolds in Sobolev spaces*, J. Funct. Anal. **80** (1988), 60–75.

[12] H.Brezis, J.M. Coron, and E.H. Lieb, *Harmonic maps with defects*, Comm. Math. Phys. **107** (1986), 649–705.

[13] G.Devillanova and S.Solimini, *On the dimension of an irrigable measure*, Rend. Semin. Mat. Univ. Padova **117** (2007), 1–49.

[14] M.Giaquinta, G.Modica and J. Soucek, *The Dirichlet energy of mappings with values into the sphere*, Manuscripta Math. **65** (1989), 489–507.

[15] M.Giaquinta, G.Modica and J. Soucek,*Cartesian currents in the calculus of variations. I. Cartesian currents*, Springer (1998).

[16] P.Hajlasz, *Approximation of Sobolev mappings*, Nonlinear Anal. **22** (1994), 1579–1591.

[17] F.Hang and F.H. Lin, *Topology of Sobolev mappings*, Math. Res. Lett. **8** (2001),321–330.

[18] F.Hang and F. H.Lin, *Topology of Sobolev mappings II*, Acta Math. **191** (2003) 55–107.

[19] R.Hardt and T. Rivière, *Connecting topological Hopf singularities*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci.**2** (2003),287–344.

[20] R.Hardt and T. Rivière, *Ensembles singuliers topologiques dans les espaces fonctionnels entres variétes* Séminaire EDP, Ecole Polytechnique (2001-2002). 14p.

[21] R.Hardt and T. Rivière, *Connecting rational homotopy type singularities*, Acta Math. **200** (2008), 15–83.

[22] T. Isobe, *Characterization of the strong closure of* $C^\infty(\mathbb{B}^4;S^2)$ *in* $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^4,\mathbb{S}^2)$ *for* $\frac{16}{5}p<4$. J. Math. Anal. Appl.**190** (1995) 361–372.

[23] A. Kosinski, *Differential manifolds*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, Academic Press, (1993).

[24] M.Pakzad and Rivière, *Weak density of smooth maps for the Dirichlet energy between manifolds* Geom. Funct. Anal. **13** (2003) 223–257.

[25] L. Pontrjagin, A classification of mappings of the three-dimensional complex into the two-dimensional sphere, Rec. Math. [Mat. Sbornik] N.S. 9(51) (1941) 331–363.

[26] T.Rivière, *Minimizing fibrations and p-harmonic maps in homotopy classes from* $\mathbb{S}^3$ *into* $\mathbb{S}^2$. Comm. Anal. Geom. **6** (1998), 427–483.

[27] R.Schoen and K.Uhlenbeck, *Boundary regularity and the Dirichlet problem for harmonic maps*, J. Differential Geom. **18** (1983), 253–268.

[28] Q.Xia, *Optimal paths related to transport problems*, Commun. Contemp. Math.**5** (2003), 251–279.

[29] Q.Xia and A.Vershynina, *On the transport dimension of measures*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **41** (2009/10) 2407–2430.